THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXVIII.—OCTOBER, 1903—No. 112.

MOST REV. PATRICK JOHN RYAN, D. D., LL. D., FIFTY YEARS A PRIEST.

ON SEPTEMBER 8, 1903, Most Rev. Patrick John Ryan, D. D., LL. D., completed his fiftieth year in the Priesthood. It is fitting that this event should be recorded here, because for the past thirteen years Archbishop Ryan has been Editor-in-chief of *The American Catholic Quarterly Review*. When he arrived in this diocese, in 1884, he found the *Review* flourishing under the management of Mr. Charles Hardy, its owner, and under the editorial direction of Right Rev. Monsignor Corcoran. Always a man of letters and fully alive to the value of such a publication, which from its beginning, in 1876, had raised the standard of Catholic periodical literature to the highest point, the Archbishop encouraged the faithful, enthusiastic and self-sacrificing owner and the learned and devoted editor by every means in his power.

When Monsignor Corcoran died, in 1889, Mr. Hardy induced the Archbishop to take the chair of Editor-in-chief. He did so most reluctantly, because the duties of Archbishop in so large a diocese already weighed heavily upon him, and because he would not assume any office if he could not fulfil its obligations. For the sake of Catholic truth he consented, and in his salutatory, in April, 1890, announced, after paying glowing tribute to his illustrious predecessor, that he should follow in his footsteps. The aims of the *Quarterly* had been so admirably set forth in the beginning, and the means adopted to attain them had proved so completely adequate, that he would be rash indeed who would turn aside from the one or neglect the other.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1902, by P. J. Ryan, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

Time has proved the wisdom of this course. Under the wise direction of Archbishop Ryan, the *Quarterly* has continued to fulfil the mission assigned to it in the beginning. It has at all times explained and defended the Catholic theory of revealed Truth; it has shown the practical development and working of Catholic principle in the history of the world; it has devoted no small number of its pages to the service of philosophy and science; it has not neglected politics, using that world in its higher sense; and true to each part of its name, it has always given special attention to the origin and progress of the Catholic Church in America.

The success of the *Review* must be attributed first of all and principally to him. He chose the assistant editors, he directed them in their labors, his prudence guided them in time of doubt and uncertainty, his patience sustained them in time of trial, his experience warned them in time of danger, and his learning led them in time of darkness.

The American Catholic Quarterly Review owes a deep debt of gratitude to Most Rev. Archbishop Ryan, and wishes to record it in this year of jubilee, when all the golden deeds of that fruitful half century are being woven into a beautiful historical tapestry by the love of all his spiritual children.

LEO XIII.

THE illustrious Pontiff who on the 20th of July passed away to eternal rest has filled so large a place in the thoughts of men during a quarter of a century that it is difficult to appreciate to the full the outcome of his acts and the results of his influence in relation to the history of the world. The historian of a future day will apportion him the place he shall occupy in the annals of the Church and of the world, and allot to him his grade in the glorious line of great Pontiffs who have occupied the Chair of Saint Peter. He is too near our day, and the memory of him and of his works so fill the thoughts of his contemporaries that it is difficult to appreciate them with impartiality. His life and work are so familiar, either wholly or in part, to the men of this age that they impress the judgment and affect the sense of historic perspective. All the world feels poorer for his loss. He was known to all the world. The many hundreds of thousands of men and women from every civilized land under heaven who visited Rome either as pilgrims or tourists during the twenty-five years of his Pontificate strove to see him face to face, and had their wish gratified. And the many millions who have not had this privilege knew his name and acknowledged his virtues and were aware of the efforts he made to procure justice for the oppressed and to inculcate charity and peace among men and nations.

The life of Leo XIII. embraces almost a whole century, and that one of the most notable centuries in modern history. When he was born (2d March, 1810) the great Napoleon was at the zenith of his power, and was consolidating his position by his marriage with the Archduchess Maria Louisa, daughter of Francis II., Emperor of Austria. A year older than the King of Rome, the future Leo XIII. was a student in the Roman College, writing notable essays and pursuing his studies, when, in the summer of 1832, this heir to the empty title lay dying at Schönbrunn. Leo XIII. was in his sixth year when the Emperor Napoleon was hopelessly defeated at Waterloo, and he was a student eleven years old, attending the Jesuit College at Viterbo, when Napoleon passed away, an exile and a prisoner of the English Government at Longwood in the Island of St. Helena. He was contemporary with the greatest men of the century, being three months younger than Mr. Gladstone and a year younger than Abraham Lincoln; he was four years older than Bismarck and twelve years older than General Grant—all of whom he outlived. He had seen the fall of the first French Empire, and the rise and fall of the second, with intermediate Monarchy and

Republic. In his country home in the neighborhood of Carpineto, amidst the Lepine Hills, he may have heard in his childhood rumors of the events that shook the world and of the deeds enacted by the men who were most prominent in the first quarter of the nineteenth century. He lived to become acquainted with the men who were foremost at its close, and he brought its memories into the new century. The story of his career, embracing so lengthy and changeful a period of human history, in much of which he took a conspicuous part, employing his influence for the good of mankind, possesses more than ordinary interest to every thinking man.

The time in which the future Pope opened his eyes upon the world was of paramount importance in the history of the Church. The atmosphere in which he grew up and lived in his early years made its impression on his intellect and character. He came of a hardy, healthy stock, occupying a lonely town set deep amidst the hills, and from them he inherited the vigor and nervous enduring force that made him the wonder of all who saw him in his later years. Gioacchino Pecci, as he afterwards called himself, selecting this name from those given him at baptism: Gioacchino, Vincenzo—the name his mother preferred—Raffaele and Luigi—was the sixth child and fourth son of Colonel Ludovico Pecci and Anna Prosperi Buzi his wife; and he was born at Carpineto, a little mountain town situated amidst the Lepine Hills and in the Diocese of Anagni. The name of Anagni is noted in history as a nursery of Popes, four occupants of the Papal Chair during the thirteenth century having come from this diocese: Innocent III., Gregory IX., Alexander IV. and Boniface VIII. It is also raised into world-wide renown in the pages of Dante's "Divina Commedia," where he describes the outrages wrought on Pope Boniface VIII. by the French and the Colonna faction, when the "vinegar and gall" were renewed,

> And Christ in his own Vicar captive made.

The family of the Peccis, which originally came from Cortona, settled in Siena about the year 1300, and there became rich and illustrious. Members of the family filled positions of importance in that city, and the Pecci Palace, still standing there, bespeaks their ancient glory. One of them, Giovanni Pecci, was Bishop of Grosseto, a poet and author of a life of Saint Catherine of Siena. His tomb in the Cathedral of his native place is visited chiefly because it was carved by Donatello. In 1340 another one of the family, Benvenuto, was enrolled in the Order of the Knights of Malta, and at this period that was the most warlike order in Europe. Early in the fifteenth century Giacomo Pecci received into his house Pope Martin V. when passing through Siena, and lent him 25,000 florins,

receiving in pledge the Castle of Spoleto. Another of the family, Pietro Pecci, who was born in Spain, became a member of the Hermits of Saint Jerome, founded by his grandfather, and was declared Blessed. Margaret Pecci, of the Servites of Mary, was also beatified, and her portrait in the brown habit of her order hangs in the bedroom occupied by Gioacchino Pecci in Carpineto. The young Giacchino, while he was still a student at the Accademia Ecclesiastica at Rome was gathering materials for an elaborate genealogical tree founded on the best authors, on family traditions and documents. On his mother's side he was related to the celebrated Cola di Rienzi. Angelo Rienzi, son of the last of the Roman Tribunes, after his father's death took refuge at Cori, where he changed his name into that of Prosperi; and from him descended Anna Prosperi Buzi, mother of Leo XIII. A natural and just pride in his ancestry, and a special devotion to the saintly members of his race, inspired his acts and uplifted his thoughts.

The education of young Gioacchino Pecci, begun at home under the wisest and tenderest of teachers, was continued at Rome, to which the child was sent at the age of seven. A year later he and his brother Joseph, nearly three years his elder, were sent to the Jesuits' College at Viterbo. This order had been restored and was beginning again its great teaching mission. On the feast of St. Aloysius, in the year 1821, Gioacchino Pecci made his first Communion in the church of the college. Now his letters begin, and the distinction and stateliness of thought and phrase which marked his writings during his whole life begin to appear. Nothing reveals better than the familiar spontaneous letters written for the occasion the character of an individual. At the age of ten young Pecci writes to his father: "Pray for me and for my brother, and tell mamma that I have received the Life of St. Francis of Assisi, which I asked from her, and also that of St. Louis." The clear and elegant handwriting, resembling print, which begins hesitatingly in his earliest letters and afterwards becomes more accurate, is maintained throughout his life. The careful mode in which his letters are written may be taken as an indication of his faculty for taking pains and for expressing the clearness and accuracy of his thought in the clearest form. It is in this early period also that he is first taken by the desire of writing Latin verses, and in a letter to his mother in the April of 1820, asking her to come and see himself and his brother, he adds: "On this occasion I would also wish that you would procure me the 'Regia Parnassi' to teach me to make Latin verse."

The record of great men's school days is always interesting. There are to be seen the first signs of the working of that mind which, in its after development, arrests the attention of the world. While he asked his mother to supply him with the "Regia Parnassi,"

he thanked her for the *pigne*—a sort of pie—which she had sent him. He outgrew his love for *pigne*, but the habit of making Latin verses remained with him even to the end. "To write in an idiom which has passed away in a really personal style," wrote M. Georges Goyan, "gives the effect of an impossibility attempted. Leo XIII. achieved it. He does not fulfil the task of an editor in Latin; nineteen centuries after the Incarnation the Pope is a Latin author. His early education began this miracle; his coming to the Pontifical throne finished it. Previous to assuming the Tiara he possessed the skill and the impeccable elegance of the humanist; but upon the tablets of a scholar, however learned he may be, Latin remains a dead language. . . . Leo XIII. in becoming Pope was established in the only place in the world where this language remained alive. . . . The Holy See prolongs the posthumous existence of the old language in *saecula saeculorum*." He had no idea that he was in any way specially gifted. To his brother at Carpineto he writes, in his twelfth year, that the prizes which his "very small capacity" enabled him to obtain were not won "without some difficulty." In his eighteenth year while he was in the Roman College he wrote to his brother at home: "My mind is turned towards the most arduous mathematical calculations. I study the laws which Divine Wisdom has established over bodies and over the physical world. In chemistry I observe the phenomena of Nature. In astronomy I measure the distances of the planets and of the solar disc, or again I admire the grandeur of their orb and the majesty of their regular revolution. Such is my life, in a restricted circle of choice friends."

It is in his eighteenth year also that we find his first mention of Saint Thomas Aquinas, whose works and system he will in after years bring into use and honor by his authority as Sovereign Pontiff. He writes to his brother Carlo, at Carpineto: "Do me the favor of sending as soon as possible by the first occasion the 'Summa Theologica' of St. Thomas. . . . If by chance you should also find there some work on Dogmatic—but not on Moral—you would do me a pleasure to send it at your convenience. But St. Thomas I ask of you at once; he is the archimandrite of theologians." Half a century later, on the 4th of August, 1879, the philosophic system of this "archimandrite of theologians," restored to all its purity, was recommended to the study of the Catholic clergy especially, in the Pontifical Encyclical "Aeterni Patris." "The thoughts of youth are long, long thoughts," says the poet. In the case of Gioacchino Pecci, the aftermath of great and noble works which he accomplished is indicated in the thoughts and convictions of his youth, ripening through the years of his manhood, and coming forth in power and

majesty in his mature old age. The Rev. H. T. Henry, of Overbrook Seminary, in his "Poems, Charades, Inscriptions of Leo XIII.," has made it evident that from the age of twelve, when his first Latin verses are printed, down to the last, few years have passed without some Latin verse or poem. So is it in other cases. The admiration for St. Thomas Aquinas which he has as a youth becomes stronger as the years go on, and in Perugia, where he was Archbishop, he, in 1858, drew up the regulations for an Accademia of St. Thomas Aquinas, which, however, in consequence of the vicissitudes of the times, could not be established until 1872. This Accademia was a union of priests with the object of the study of the works of the Angelic Doctor. The matters to be treated of, according to the new regulations of 1872, are theological and philosophical in relation to the new errors against the faith and against sound philosophy; deduced always from the works of the Angelic Doctor, which are studied during the year. In 1875, at the head of the Bishops of Umbria, the Cardinal Archbishop of Perugia addresses a request to Pope Pius IX. asking that St. Thomas Aquinas may be constituted the Patron of Catholic Colleges and Universities. And, in 1880, a non-Catholic writer, speaking of the Papal Encyclical on the Restoration of Christian Philosophy in Catholic Universities, according to the mind of St. Thomas Aquinas, the Angelic Doctor, said: "Of the innumerable testimonies to the impression left by this remarkable man on the mind of Western Christendom, the recent Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo XIII. may well be esteemed the most noteworthy, and not least for the air of anachronism that hangs about it." The Encyclical was soon followed by a letter which Leo XIII. addressed to Cardinal de Luca, Prefect of the Congregation of Studies, announcing his intention of founding in Rome an Accademia with the object of defending and explaining the doctrine of St. Thomas; and he announced also his project of having a new and complete edition of the works of the Angelic Doctor published. During the twenty-four years that have elapsed since that letter was written thirteen huge tomes of St. Thomas have been published, and from fourteen to fifteen years more, at the present rate of progress, will be required for the completion of the work. These are the essential outcome of the conviction of young Pecci in 1828 when he became acquainted with "the archimandrite of theologians!"

It is about this period also that his letters begin to be concerned with the events of the time and to constitute a record of the men who were prominent in the Rome of these days. The letters were intended to enlighten his brothers at Carpineto, in the great dearth of newspapers then prevailing, what was occurring in Rome. He, on the 20th of February, 1829, writes a letter in a shoemaker's

workshop, "because the post was about to close," describing the death of Pope Leo XII. "Without other preamble," he writes, "I begin then the series of these letters, warning you that I will treat only of the election of the new Roman Pontiff." It is always a matter of supreme interest to learn who the new Pope may be, and what he has been in the past, as a hint of what he may be in the future. The same anxiety has prevailed during the Conclave that succeeded the death of Leo XIII., as he himself records in that succeeding the death of Leo XII. "At last, thanks be to God," he writes, "there is a new Pontiff, a new Bishop of Rome!" He had already related the gossip of the Conclave. "In the Conclave no one holds to Pacca any more. De Gregorio is quite *papabile;* a good number of Cardinals give him their votes and do not *accede* for any other. Many engagements sustain the party of Castiglioni, which is supported by Albani and his followers. Cardinals Cristaldi and Cappellari [who afterwards became Pope Gregory XVI.] continue to gain votes." Such are a few of the notes in the letter sent by this most observing and well informed youth of nineteen to his friends in Carpineto. Of the new Pope, Castiglioni, who took the name of Pius VIII., this young student wrote: "He has a wry neck, and seems to dance when he walks!" And he adds: "I think I have heard formerly that this Castiglioni, being Vicar General under Mgr. Devoti, Bishop of Anagni, had stopped at our house in Carpineto. If one was certain of this it would be a favorable occasion to inscribe on the walls of our house so happy an event. Find out if it is true; for papa will certainly have preserved the memory of it."

The day-by-day life of Rome at a most interesting and little-known period is vividly described in these letters of an observant young student. The capacity for appreciating the qualities of men, and for ranging them according to their genuine abilities, is shown by this young man from time to time. "On Sunday, the 7th (April, 1829), the feast of St. Vincent, there took place in St. Peter's the solemn Coronation," he says, "of which I was able, to my great satisfaction, to observe all the particulars, all the ceremonial in use in such circumstance." One might almost say that destiny was leading him, and that he was being instructed unconsciously in the ceremonial of which he was to be the object forty-nine years later. There was no one more particular than he in the rigorous fulfilment of ceremonial when it came his turn to be Pope, and evidently he watched with keen eyes the ceremonies of the coronation of Pope Pius VIII. The historical memories of the early half of the last century, so little known nowadays, are enlivened by the remarks on current events in the letters of Gioacchino Pecci. He says, in one letter,

that his departure home to Carpineto is deferred in order that he may be present at the arrival of the King of Naples, who will pass some days at Rome with his daughter Cristina, the future Queen of Spain. "He will dwell in a semi-official fashion," he writes, "in the palace of the Duke of Lucca, as in a hotel. There will be given to their Majesties, during their sojourn, some fêtes and diversions which I may be able to recount to you afterwards."

In the following year, by the death of Pius VIII., he has another Conclave to tell of. Writing on the 14th of December, 1830, he says: "Yesterday it was said the Cardinals would not go in procession from S. Silvestro to the Quirinal, according to custom. With regard to so extraordinary a determination some attributed it to the rainy weather, others put forth as a pretext the discovery of a conspiracy tending to disturb the actual political situation in Rome. The son of Hortense and of Jerome [Louis, rather] Bonaparte, the Noble Guard Troili, Ernesto Gozzano and many Frenchmen are mentioned by everybody as the authors of this conspiracy. But just at this moment I have learned that the news is false. The Cardinals will enter processionally into Conclave according to custom." The son of Hortense and Louis Bonaparte, King of Holland, became known to fame afterwards as Napoleon III., Emperor of the French. He had served his apprenticeship as a conspirator in Italy, and was so bound to the revolutionary party there that it was only by his assistance to their advancement, even to the seizure of Rome, that his life was spared.

The election of Gregory XVI. followed, and the young Pecci, now reaching his majority and with a keenness of judgment far beyond his years, relates the event to his brother in Carpineto. There were few present, he says, at the Quirinal, where the Conclave was held, when the announcement was made, but when the cannon thundered forth the glad tidings an innumerable multitude ascended to the Quirinal. "It was then that the new Pontiff, surrounded by Cardinals, was brought, against habitual usage, into the great *loggia*, or balcony, and blessed the immense crowd which received him with the greatest acclamations." When Leo XIII. did not give his blessing from the external *loggia* of St. Peter's, and when this example was followed by Pope Pius X., it was said that political feeling restrained them; this letter of young Pecci recording Pope Gregory's coming to the Quirinal *loggia* describes it as contrary to habitual usage. Continuing to tell his friends in Carpineto the gossip prevailing in Rome, he relates how Cardinal Micara protested in Conclave against the election of Cappellari (Gregory XVI.), who, "though very worthy of the Sovereign Pontificate, was none the less an Austrian subject." And immediately after he adds: "The revo-

lution is propagated in the other Legations of Forli, Ferrara and Ravenna." He fills many pages with a concise and vivid chronicle of the attempt at revolution made in Rome, and how it was obviated. Of one of the Napoleons—Napoleon Bonaparte, brother of Louis, afterwards Emperor of the French—he writes in March, 1831: "It is said and affirmed that the son of Louis Bonaparte, who made common cause with the insurgents, has just died at Perugia from a cold which carried him off in five days." The actual fact was, however, that he died at a small hotel in Forli from an attack of measles, his mother, Queen Hortense, assisting and nursing him. Thus this young ecclesiastical student in the Rome of Pope Gregory's early years had his eyes and ears open, and acquired an acquaintance with the mode of governing and dealing with state difficulties which he turned to good account afterwards. On one occasion he laments his illness, which interrupts "the free course of studies, my sole care." In 1832 he is made a shepherd of Arcadia, that ancient literary Accademia of Rome, and receives the name of Neander Heracleus, which shines in the records of the Accademia even till now. He has an interest even in English politics, and notes that the Duke of Wellington has not been able to form a new ministry. Again, he turns to literature, describing the "Dialogues" of Count Leopardi as above all criticism. But his chief preoccupation, outside of his studies, is the political situation. He rejoices at the news communicated to him by his uncle Antonio of the inscription of the Pecci family to the generous nobility of Anagni; but it is not for "ephemeral vanity" that he rejoices, but that nothing now is opposed to his admission into the Academy of Noble Ecclesiastics. This Academy, which is a nursery of Cardinals, is neither a seminary nor a college, but a free institution in which young ecclesiastical students of noble birth are received, and who while following the courses of theology and philosophy, received also a special instruction comprising administrative and diplomatic sciences. It was natural that such a student of government in action, as Pecci proved himself to be, should desire to become acquainted with the principles that regulate government and the relations of one power with another.

In 1833 he is only four days at Carpineto when he writes that this year is entirely to be consecrated to his studies, "and study agrees ill with noise and fêtes. Study has need of a certain solitude." The idea of a concursus or dispute "on all theology, in presence of the Sovereign Pontiff," comes to him, but it intimidates him greatly. But the rumor of his intention has spread abroad. Pacca knows it, and rejoices at it, and encourages him. It is an expensive display, and Pecci finds that he cannot do it for less than 700 crowns, perhaps

more. "Di Pietro," he says, "has devoted nearly 3,000 crowns to it at the Apollinare; Cullen [afterwards Archbishop of Dublin and Cardinal], about 1,000 at the Propaganda; Arnaldi, at least 800 at the Sapienza; these are the last disputants of theses dedicated to the Pope, two to Leo XII. and one to Pius VIII." His studies continue to be his great preoccupation. In 1835 he writes to Carpineto that a dissertation in which he had taken part with many Roman abbés, and which he wrote for an extraordinary *concursus* on Public Ecclesiastical Law, won for him from the Pious Union of St. Paul the majority of votes and the prize. The prize was thirty sequins. The subject was that of "Immediate Appeal to the Sovereign Pontiff in Person." That great *concursus*, about which he was so anxious, was held in the September of this year, Cardinal Sala presiding at it. "It succeeded very well," he wrote. His career began shortly after this. In 1837, on the 6th of February, he was made one of Pope Gregory XVI.'s Domestic Prelates. A few months later, by a letter from the Secretary of State, his appointment as Ponente del Buon Governo is announced to him. With the sincerity that he was accustomed to use in speaking to his relatives of his affairs he declares that since the day on which in order to respond to the desire of his father, he entered upon the career which he was pursuing, he had only one object in view: to employ all his efforts and all laudable conduct to advance in the hierarchical posts of the prelature, "and that our family, profiting by such lustre and credit, which, thanks be to God! has not failed it to this hour, may increase its just reputation in the country." This is the noble ambition that inspires him; later a new spirit and aim take possession of him. He had received the order of sub-deacon on the 17th of December of this same year, and the diaconate on Christmas Eve. "If it please God," he writes, "I will, by the hands of His Eminence Cardinal Odescalchi, be ordained priest on the last day of the year. Thus I shall inaugurate the new year by ascending the holy altar." In the little chapel of St. Stanislaus in the novitiate of the Jesuits at S. Andrea del Quirinale, at 5 in the morning of January 1, 1838, he celebrated his first Mass. "I am filled with joy," he wrote to Cardinal Sala on the following day, "and with all my heart I bless God, who, after having invested me with so sublime a dignity, accords to me besides the consolation of this peace and spiritual sweetness which *exsuperat omnem sensum*." In asking previously for the prayers of Cardinal Sala he expressed his desire to be a "true priest, and to be able to serve God and concur zealously to His glory, and to do so really in the sense in which St. Ignatius understood it and in which his spiritual sons, among whom I have had the good fortune to live, understood it." And he had a strong inclina-

tion to abandon the world and to give himself up wholly to the spiritual life; he would have become a Jesuit if he had been able to recognize within him the special vocation necessary for that state. These revelations of the inmost thoughts and aspirations of the young ecclesiastic who has entered upon an administrative and political career in the service of the Church possess great interest in view of his after life. The sincerity and devotion of Monsignor Gioacchino continue with him throughout his life. As the child is father to the man, so, in his case, the young prelate is father to the aged Pope. It was about this period also that he entered upon that severe *régime* of life which he carried through to the end. When the cholera of 1837 was raging in Rome, and numbers were dying daily, the young Pecci attended the sick with devotion and self-sacrifice. At the height of the summer heats he wrote to his brother: "I have never enjoyed a better or more perfect state of health than at present. I owe this to the *régime* of regular life which I have imposed upon myself." Sixty years later he told the secret in his "Poem on Frugality and Long Life," which was translated by such masters of verse as Andrew Lang and Rev. H. T. Henry, and which is worthy of its author.

In 1838 a despatch from Cardinal Gamberini, Secretary of State, to Monsignor Pecci announced that the Pope had raised the young prelate from the charge of Ponente of the Sacred Congregation of the Buon Governo to that of Delegate Apostolic of the Province of Benevento. This marks the beginning of a career for which his past studies and labors had prepared him. Heretofore he is of Carpineto; henceforth the world is before him. "One comprehends Leo XIII. only in his native country," wrote M. Boyer d'Agen in the Pecci album at Carpineto a few years ago; "mountains, high as his thoughts; a solitude, profound as his sentiments. The rocks of Carpineto preserve the first page of a great life, of which the deserts of Rome will have but the last page."

The task which Mgr. Pecci had to fulfil in Benevento was of peculiar difficulty. Here brigandage had been brought to the perfection of a fine art, and contraband practices were rife all over the land. The government which the new Delegate aimed at establishing was based on the complete abolition of both these irregularities. On his arrival here Mgr. Pecci was brought to death's door by a malignant fever, which kept him a month in bed and a second month in convalescence. In his third month here he began to gather up the tangled skein of former neglect or weakness, and strove to put matters into order and regularity. It was here that a frequently quoted incident occurred. A provincial grandee called on the Delegate one day to reproach him with the violation of antique privileges

belonging to him in his quality as Marquis. Rising to the occasion the Marquis threatened the Delegate, saying he would proceed to Rome and return with the decree suspending the Delegate from his functions. "Very well, sir marquis," replied the pale and delicate-looking Delegate, "but remember that before reaching the Vatican you have to pass by the Castle of St. Angelo." This castle was then used as a prison. The Marquis postponed his journey. The attitude of Mgr. Pecci to his work at Benevento is described by himself in a letter to his brother, Giovanni Battista. "The affairs of the province are going on regularly," he writes. "The opinion of the majority, that is, of the people, is favorable to me. My guide in every matter is conscience and duty; my system, a complete freedom from all kinds of shackles; and I am on the alert for every cabal and each intrigue. This sort of tactics is strange to the nobles and others accustomed to a different system. It has none the less merited for me the title of a lover of justice, and has satisfied my conscience all the more. This will make me never forsake it." "Conscience and duty!" These are the principles that sustain him in this most difficult situation. With these as guides, whatsoever his fate, he is always master of himself.

During the period of his delegation in Benevento he paid a visit to the celebrated monastery of Monte Cassino. In the visitors' book for the year 1839 the traveler may read at the top of a page in that old-fashioned, compressed and elegant script which was specially his, his name and title: "Gioacchino Pecci, Pontifical Delegate to Benevento, 24th April, 1839." He stayed at the monastery eight days, and at all times, especially after he became Pope, he showed a paternal interest in the Benedictines of Monte Cassino. The admiration which he had in 1839 for the famous monastery of Monte Cassino found new expression sixty-four years later, when he contributed largely to the construction of an international college of Benedictines dedicated to S. Anselm and erected on the Aventine Hill at Rome. "With this month of March," he wrote in 1841, "begins the fourth year of my Delegation at Benevento. Will it be the last? Let us hope so." His work was accomplished; peace prevailed throughout the delegation and industries were revived. In June of this year he was nominated to the delegation, but that was soon changed for the more important one of Perugia. The love of justice, the fulfilment of duty according to his conscience, which had been the principles of his conduct in Benevento, directed his action in Perugia and brought him the respect of the people. Pope Gregory XVI. made a tour through the States of the Church, and Mgr. Pecci had news of his coming to Perugia twenty days previously. In these twenty days, by his energy and care, a new

road, the Via Gregoriana, was made from the valley below into the city, so that the Pope might make the ascent with greater ease. The compliment which the Pontiff paid to the Delegate has become historic: "In my journey I have been received in some places as a friar; in several others fittingly, but as a Cardinal; but in Ancona and Perugia I have been received really as a Sovereign!" The thoroughness that distinguished all the work that Mgr. Pecci undertook received its praise in these words.

In January, 1843, when he had received the announcement of his appointment as Nuncio Apostolic to Brussels, he wrote to his brother Charles at Carpineto giving him the official notification of it; he adds: "Oh! if only our good parents were still living! I cannot think of it without feeling my heart bleed." In February he was consecrated titular Archbishop of Damietta, and in March he set out for his mission. On his journey, which occupied three weeks, he learned sufficient French to converse in this language on his arrival in Brussels. A plain statement made concerning the Nuncio to Belgium was that sent by M. Noyer, Belgian Charge d'Affaires at Rome, to Bishop, afterwards Cardinal Wiseman: "Mgr. Pecci is a man of excellent character, of a calm and staid mind and of exemplary piety. With his great desire of doing good I do not doubt that Mgr. Pecci may satisfy all the exigencies of his position." His work here was accomplished with a success like to that achieved in Benevento and Perugia. The most important event that occurred during his stay here was, he writes, the arrival of the Queen of England in Belgium on a visit to her uncle, King Leopold. The entrance of the Queen into Brussels was magnificent, he wrote, and in the evening the illuminations were superb. "To the banquet of the sovereigns the diplomatic corps was also invited. Queen Victoria sat at the middle of the table, between the King and Queen of the Belgians. As I was placed at the side of them, I had an opportunity of observing the royal guests and of speaking a few words to them. The Queen of England is not tall, her expression is vivacious." Three years later, when his Nunciature was at an end, Mgr. Pecci visited England, heard O'Connell in the House of Commons, was presented again to the Queen and passed a month in London. He was the bearer of a letter from King Leopold I. to Pope Gregory XVI., in which the King recommended Archbishop Pecci to the benevolent protection of His Holiness. "He has merit in every point of view," wrote the King, "for I have rarely seen a more sincere devotion to duty, intentions more pure and actions more upright." Thus it is that the goodness and force of character, the conscientious fulfilment of duty which was the rule of his life, impressed those who were acquainted with him, and made them

desirous of furthering him in his career. When Mgr. Pecci reached Rome Gregory XVI. was dead. The returning Nuncio met with Cardinal Mastai Ferretti and had a lengthy conversation with him on the actual situation of the Church. "The two future Popes," writes M. Julien de Narfon, "exchanged views upon the government of souls; curious meeting and most interesting conversation, if one thinks on the common destinies of these two men and on the very different turn of their minds." Cardinal Mastai Ferretti became Pope Pius IX.; Archbishop Pecci went to his diocese of Perugia, where he remained thirty-two years—the whole long Pontificate of Pius IX.

The labors and solicitudes of the episcopate occupied the attention of Archbishop Pecci in Perugia. Revolution and invasion—the former in 1849, when the Garibaldians took the city and were driven forth by the Austrians; the latter when the troops of the Sardinian King in 1859 invaded this portion of the States of the Church and held it in spite of right and justice. The Archbishop, who had been nominated Cardinal in 1853, protested, but was powerless to do more. It would be a long task to tell of the various churches restored, of the new ones built—no less than thirty-six churches were built, and the construction of ten more projected when he was called to Rome—of the charitable institutions established for castaways and orphans and superannuated priests, of the impulse given to studies by the founding of academies and the extension of the seminary. All these things which are included in the work of a Bishop who has the good of his people at heart were carried out to completion by Cardinal Pecci with his calm wisdom and in accordance with his conscientious sense of duty.

It has been said that every time a new Pope ascends the Chair of Peter Catholics experience some hesitation concerning the line he will follow. And this hesitation, together with an anxiety regarding the attitude he might take towards Italy, was felt on the accession of Cardinal Pecci as Leo XIII. A profound emotion pervaded the whole Church on the death of Pius IX. It might be said that the whole Catholic Hierarchy was composed of those whom he had chosen. His long life had rendered him so firmly associated with the Pontificate that when he passed away men said that the Papacy had come to an end.

The Conclave from which Leo XIII. came forth was one of the shortest on record. For some time previous to the death of Pius IX. it was observed that two Cardinals united in a remarkable degree the virtues and qualities which the circumstances seemed to require. These were Cardinal Riario Sforza, Archbishop of Naples, and Pecci, Archbishop of Perugia. Both of them were excellent administrators, moderate in politics, and both had shown great firmness re-

garding the principles and rights of the Holy See, while they knew how to keep themselves aloof from party. Cardinal Sforza preceded Pius IX. in the tomb; Pecci was left, and was the most noticeable figure in the Conclave. He had been appointed Camerlengo in 1877, shortly after the death of Cardinal Antonelli, Secretary of State, and in this office he directed the labors in the Vatican preparatory to the Conclave with that calm and serene judgment and method for which he had always been distinguished. The night previous to his election, as his conclavist, the late Mgr. Foschi, Archbishop of Perugia, related in the hearing of the writer, he slept on a mattress placed in one of the corridors of the Vatican. He did not know the rooms and halls in this Apostolic palace; on one occasion when he came to Rome he called at the Vatican eleven times before he was admitted to the presence of Pius IX., and this delay was attributed to Cardinal Antonelli, who was said to be jealous of the qualities of Cardinal Pecci and of the influence he might wield over Pius IX.

When the election was over, and the name of Leo XIII., who had received 44 out of 61 votes, was announced from the balcony above the central entrance to St. Peter's by the aged Cardinal Prospero Caterini, the new Pontiff, regarding the world from the solitary height of the Papacy, began to think how, in this most elevated and most serious of all earthly dignities, he should reconcile conscience and duty to the settlement of the difficulties before him. Cardinal Newman has declared that, by their office, the Popes are brought across every form of earthly power; "for they have a mission to high as well as low, and it is on the high, and not on the low, that their maintenance ordinarily depends. Cæsar ministers to Christ; the framework of society, itself a divine ordinance, receives such important aid from the sanction of religion that it is its interest in turn to uphold religion and to enrich it with temporal gifts and honors." Of Leo XIII., in this moment of entering upon his new task, it has been said that from the time when he succeeded Pope Pius he had formed a grand plan, "in which he took cognizance of all the needs of humanity and determined on the provisions he would make for those needs during the whole course of his Pontificate." His action moved in three special lines: the development of studies, and to such an extent that in the second year of his reign the name given by the Romans to his Pontificate was the Pontificate of the learned; an effective interest taken in the question of social science, and, finally, strenuous efforts employed to bring peace to Christian nations. The Holy See is considered by thinkers as standing at the head of Christian civilization; and as soon as Leo XIII. had assumed the white robe of the Pontiff he began to look out upon the world and see what were the most crying needs of Christendom. It became his task to close the dissen-

sions that separated the rulers of nations from the Church and to bind with stronger bonds of affection the peoples that held firm to the faith. On the very day of his election he sent forth letters to the sovereigns of Europe announcing his accession to the Pontifical throne.

The Emperor of Germany, William I., was at the head of the nation which from 1870 to 1878 had been the most active in its hostility to the Catholic Church, and therefore the Pontiff turned his attention to him on the very day of his election. After saluting "the most august and powerful Emperor and King" and announcing his elevation to the See of the Prince of the Apostles, the new Pontiff writes: "As to our great regret the happy relations which existed formerly between the Holy See and your Majesty have been broken off, we address your magnanimity in view of obtaining that peace and tranquillity of conscience *may be restored* to a great number of your subjects; and the Catholic subjects of your Majesty will not fail to show themselves, as the faith which they profess prescribes, devotedly respectful and faithful to your Majesty." The appeal of the Pontiff was not immediately listened to, but it prevailed in the long run; and the present Emperor of Germany paid, a few months ago, his third visit to the Vatican. The persecutions and imprisonment of Archbishops and Bishops, such as Ledochowski and Melchers and Eberhard and Martin, are forgiven, and the Catholics of Germany, though not having all the privileges they wish for, enjoy a considerable share of freedom. Circumstances favored the Pope. Prince Bismarck, when conciliation with the Pope was proposed to him, declared he would not go to Canossa; but a quarrel with Spain concerning proprietorship in the Caroline Islands drove him to seek a mediator in the person of Leo XIII., and thus the Iron Chancellor went to Rome instead of to Canossa. The gentle though persistent appeal of Leo XIII. to reason and good sense conquered here, and the happy relations now existing between Berlin and the Vatican record the success of the Pontiff's policy.

In France the action of the Pope in favor of the rights of Catholics has been strenuously resisted. Without passing any judgment on the origin or legitimacy of the government existing in that country, Leo XIII., seeing how hostile to religion were its acts and tendencies, called upon the French Catholics, many of whom still hoped in a restoration of the monarchy, to rally to the support of the actual government and by their influence direct it towards right and freedom and justice. For this the Pope has been accused of interfering in the concerns of France, but no one ignores to-day, as Pere Janvier notes, that the Holy Father has not spoken as a private person; he has in his quality of Head of the Church addressed the Catholics

of France, his subjects, in the religious point of view, with the intention of giving them a particular direction. His counsel appears not to have been adopted to its full extent, and Catholic voters paid little attention to the political attitude of their representatives, provided these latter promised to further local benefits or improvements. Anyhow, the action of the Pontiff failed to bring about the end he desired. The Government of France became more violent in its antagonism to Catholic religious institutions, and the fierce persecution of the religious congregations and orders of men and women throughout France to-day can scarcely find its parallel even in the fury of the Protestant Reformation in England. In a letter to Cardinal Richard, Archbishop of Paris, on the expulsion of the religious congregations from France, the Pontiff declared that it was evident such expulsion would cause irreparable damage to the country. In shutting off so rich a source of voluntary assistance it will increase the public misery in a notable degree, and the same blow will bring an end to an eloquent and constant preaching of concord and fraternity. The words of the Pontiff, however reasonable and convincing to honest minds, were disregarded by those who were at the head of the political affairs of the country. With a patience and gentleness that were indefatigable he strove to recall this "eldest daughter of the Church" to a sense of her duty, but his efforts were unavailing, and the sorrow for France continued with him to his death. History will judge of his policy towards France; there is little reason to expect that the future verdict will differ much from that of to-day.

With the Government of Italy the Pontiff continued the policy of his predecessor, Pius IX. This government did not fail to furnish him with cause sufficient to justify his attitude. At the very beginning of his Pontificate he was desirous, as soon as he was crowned, of coming to St. Peter's and, from the inner balcony over the vestibule of the church, and looking into it, giving his benediction to the people assembled in that vast building. The Italian Government refused to take steps for the maintenance of order on the occasion. The preparations that were being made in the church for this event were suspended and undone. From that time till the time of his death the conduct of the Italian Government was, more or less as occasion arose, hostile to the Pope. The removal of the remains of Pius IX. from the temporary resting place in St. Peter's to the tomb in San Lorenzo beyond the walls offered an occasion to the rabble and anti-clericals gathered in the Eternal City to make evident to the world the mode in which the Government of Italy protected the person of the Pope. On the way between the Vatican and San Lorenzo the roughs in Rome attempted, unhindered, to "throw the

carrion into the Tiber"—that is how they described the remains of Pius IX. Signor Mancini was Minister of the Interior at the time, and though all Rome knew that day—13th July, 1881—that the body of the late Pope was to be brought that night to its resting place, he took no care for the maintenance of order; and when the shameful scenes had created a feeling of abhorrence all the world over, the careless Mancini replied to Italian ambassadors abroad that this was a display of the popular feeling in Rome towards the Pope! Many thoughtful men accused him of condoning the gross outrage. Again, another blow was struck at the Pontiff by the erection of a statue to the apostate Dominican friar Giordano Bruno in the Campo de Fiori at Rome, where he was put to death in 1600. The writings of this apostate are described as of revolting immorality, and his comedy "Il Candelaio" surpasses in vileness all that has ever been written by the foulest authors even of the present-day pagan renaissance in Italy. The proposal to erect the statue, which was objected to by some Christian town councillors, brought about a manifestation of anti-Catholic fury; and the rabble, which is at one time radical and at another anti-Papal and monarchical, went through the streets shouting: "Death to the priests! Down with the Vatican! Viva Giordano Bruno!" The authorities allow these diversions to the people. Leo XIII. felt the insult to the Vatican given by these demonstrations, carried out under the patronage of the Minister Crispi.

And at intervals of greater or less duration occasion was made by the Italian authorities to justify the saying of the Pope that in Rome he was under hostile domination. Leo XIII. was not silent in regard to this antagonism of the Italian Government to the Papacy during the twenty-five years of his reign. In encyclical letters, in discourses and in letters of less solemnity he made known to the world abroad, as well as to Italy and Rome, that the rights of the Church still endured in spite of the years that have passed since their violation, and that as long as the Papacy is not respected and made independent the country will not prosper. The general tendency of Italian legislation, at least for the last quarter of a century, has been anti-Catholic. There is no sign of a change, and the only hope expresed by the liberal monarchical journals at the death of Leo XIII. seemed to be that he would be succeeded by a Pontiff who, yielding to the exigencies of the Italian Government, might become its willing ally or servant. The dissension that exists between the Vatican and the Quirinal during the last thirty-three years cannot be healed, and there is little reason to expect that a government under the leadership of such an opponent as Zanardelli will attempt the task.

The Church in the United States, which has made such immense progress under Leo XIII., received the special care of the Pontiff. On receiving the splendidly bound copy of the American Constitution, written on parchment, which President Cleveland sent to Leo XIII. on occasion of his sacerdotal jubilee in 1888, the latter said that in the United States "men enjoy liberty in the true sense of the word, . . . religion is free to extend every day more and more the empire of Christianity and the Church is free to develop its beneficent action." The growth of new dioceses, the establishment of the Catholic University of Washington, the appointment of a Delegate Apostolic and many other minor events testify to the affection of Leo XIII. to the United States. In his letter to Cardinal Gibbons announcing the appointment of a Delegate the Pontiff wrote: "We have solemnly declared not only that your nation is as dear to Us as other nations, the most flourishing, to which it is Our custom to send representatives of Our authority, but also that We desire to see these bonds of mutual union which attach you and your faithful to Our person consolidate themselves more and more from day to day." The actual condition of the Church in the United States and its devotion to the See of St. Peter show how completely the Pontiff's desire has been fulfilled.

In Ireland and in England his influence has been exerted. Though in the former country there were moments of trouble, the firm and invincible devotion of the Irish race to the Holy See remained unaffected. Leo XIII. may be said to have gone out of his way to make known to the Irish the high esteem and the love he had for them. With regard to England, his hopes had been raised so as to look forward for a great return of its people to the Church of their fathers; but that expectation was not fulfilled, and the process of conversion to the Catholic Church goes on as before, by that of individuals. Justin McCarthy, in his "Leo XIII.," attributes to him: "A passion of philanthropy. There have been political Popes and theological Popes, but Leo the Thirteenth is above all a philanthropic Pope." And he notes that "some of the great social movements which came up during his time might well have intimidated a less heroic spirit. Some men in any position at all resembling that of Leo might have turned away in mere affright from certain of the developments of Socialism which we have all seen during these latter years. The Pope had no fear. He looked boldly and searchingly into each new phenomenon and calmly endeavored to understand its actual significance. He seems to have brought to bear no prejudices, no unalterable preconceived opinions to the task of examination." The consequence was that his encyclicals on social questions appealed directly to the reason and the heart of thinking men. The

clear-sighted and calm persuasiveness of the Pope's reasoning captured the attention of all. The singleness of purpose, the longing after justice and charity for the poor workingman which inspired his words went straight to the hearts of men. It would be rash to say that his encyclicals have changed the world or ameliorated in all parts the conditions of labor, but the consciousness has spread abroad that there is an influence at work in the world making for right and justice and for the gradual checking of "man's inhumanity to man."

Almost the whole field of human duty towards God and man has been traversed by Leo XIII. in his encyclicals. During his thirty-two years in Perugia he produced a number of pastoral letters addressed to his flock which are regarded as masterpieces in their way. The same clear expression of profound thought, the same inspiring enthusiasm for all that is saintly and noble and elevating which distinguish his encyclicals may be perceived here in germ. The man was accustomed to think clearly, to weigh dispassionately conflicting opinions, to judge impartially and to express in language that was as limpid as it was exact the pronouncements that were so important to his flock. When he reached the Papacy his flock became world-wide, and his pronouncements went to the very ends of the earth, and all men recognized their sincerity and their usefulness. In a letter to the Episcopate of Turin, Vercelli and Genoa in 1879 he defends Christian marriage, and in the following year he issued an encyclical treating the matter more extensively and protesting against divorce. The origin of political sovereignty and the advantages which the Church renders to princes and peoples were shown forth in an encyclical published in 1881. The admirable encyclical "Auspicato concessum," published in 1882, treated of St. Francis of Assisi and the propagation of the Order of Franciscan tertiaries. This was followed soon by the isuing of a Pontifical Constitution reforming the rule of the secular Third Order of St. Francis. The letters and encyclicals of Leo XIII. have been collected and fill several volumes. They constitute a marvelous testimony to the extent of his work and to his mental activity.

In the domain of science and literature and art the intelligent impulse of Leo XIII. has been felt. St. Thomas Aquinas, as the great model of Christian philosophy whose mind and principles are to be followed, was proposed to students in his encyclical of 4th August, 1879. The foundation in Rome of the Accademia of St. Thomas Aquinas followed closely on this. The science of history reaped the greatest advantage from his action regarding the Vatican Library and Archives. In a letter to Cardinals De Luca Pitra and Hergenröther in 1883 he announced the intention of opening these treasures

of history to the students of all nations, and he insisted upon the benefits the Sovereign Pontiffs have bestowed on Italy. "To the honor of the Holy See comes the greatest part of the renown which Italy has acquired in sciences and fine arts. Greek and Latin literature would have perished, or almost so, if the Popes and the clergy had not saved from shipwreck the débris of ancient works. At Rome what was done and accomplished speaks still louder: the ancient monuments preserved at great expense, new masterpieces of art created and perfected by the genius of the princes of art, museums and libraries founded, schools opened for the education of youth and the inauguration of great lyceums: all these things have brought Rome to this point of honor that, with a unanimous voice, she is declared the mother of the fine arts." The science of astronomy owes to his initiative the establishment of a new observatory at the Vatican, supported from the scant means which Leo XIII. was able to afford.

In the department of learning Leo XIII. promoted the publication of most important documents at his own expense, such as the "Regesta Pontificum." The same love of letters led him to found new halls and museums and schools. In 1880 he purchased a collection of autographs of Cardinals and Bishops who were at the Council of Trent and donated them to the Vatican archives, with a group of various manuscripts of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries containing the *corpus juris* of Justinian and the Gregorian codex. In 1882 he purchased a whole library of medical chirurgical works and placed them in the Vatican Library for the use of students. In 1891 he had the very celebrated Vatican Greek Bible reproduced in phototype, which was almost as clear as the original manuscript for the use of great libraries. In 1885 he erected a printing establishment in the Vatican for the exclusive use of the Holy See and the Sacred Congregations. All arts and sciences found an asylum in the Vatican. Painting made grand additions to the notable works in that palace under the protection of Leo XIII. The Gallery of the Candelabra, specially adorned and decorated by order of Leo XIII., presents a magnificent appearance. Here the Roman painter Ludovico Seitz has introduced his new symbolism in color and design with the happiest effect, expressing to future generations the works distinctive of the Pontificate of Leo up till 1899, when the decoration was finished. The bronze statue of St. Peter on the column commemorative of the Vatican Council in the Garden of the Pine in the Vatican, the great statue of S. Thomas Aquina in the Vatican Library and the sepulchral monument of Innocent III. in the Lateran basilica are notable indications of his encouragement to sculpture. The enlargement of the apse of this

same basilica projected by Pius IX. and, after serious counsel with the leading architects of Europe, carried out in its present splendor, is an evidence of his love for noble architecture. The construction of the Church of St. Joachim and the renewal of many buildings at his expense in Rome and in his native Carpineto are further proofs of his love for this noble art. When a gunpowder explosion took place in the military quarters beyond St. Paul's, outside Rome, and the Vatican was much shaken, it was found that the frescoes on the walls of the "Appartamente Borgia," painted by Pinturicchio, were in danger of perishing. With that love for the fine arts which he could not escape having after so long a residence in the heart of Umbria, Leo XIII. undertook the restoration of these admirable works. There are few works of the present day for which artists have more reason to be grateful than for the very careful and able restoration of Pinturicchio's paintings and of the whole of the halls executed under the intelligent direction of Leo XIII. A splendid work of elephantine bulk, containing a complete collection of heliotyphes and of chromo-lithographs illustrative of the art of this "Appartamente Borgia," was published under the patronage of the Pontiff in an edition of one hundred copies, which he sent to rulers of States and distinguished scholars throughout Europe and America. The text was supplied by the late Enrico Stevenson and the Rev. Father Ehrle, S. J. The object of this great book was to make known the art of the Umbrian master Pinturicchio. Thus Leo XIII. proved himself a most illustrious patron of the arts, as far as the condition in which he was placed made it possible.

In the department of Christian archæology, which has such close connection with the history of the Church in the early centuries of Rome, Leo XIII. has seen a considerable growth. The choicest objects found in the Catacombs or in ancient churches are preserved in a special department near the Vatican Library. De Rossi published a descriptive catalogue of the treasures accumulated in that sacred museum from the beginning of Leo XIII.'s Pontificate until 1893. The scientific historian of the early Church must take into account the testimony furnished by such findings as these to the arts and customs of early Christians. The most important in many respects of the contributions to Christian archæology is the inscription of Abercius, sent in gift by the Sultan of Turkey to His Holiness Leo XIII., which, together with another fragment of the same inscription presented to the Pope by the discoverer, Professor W. M. Ramsay, M. A., of Aberdeen, forms now the ornament of the Lateran Christian Museum. This illustrious monument may be considered the gem of the museum. These objects, which have escaped destruction in the course of the centuries, cast an unexpected light

on the Christian life and belief of the past, and come therefore within the circle of the Pope's consideration and solicitude.

Thus in all his work throughout the long course of his life Leo XIII., both in preparation for the great office he finally reached and during his twenty-five years in that office, appears as a pious, serious, thoughtful man, conscious of the weight and responsibility of his words and deeds. The thoroughness which distinguished him as a youth accompanies him through life, even to the very last days. His heart and mind are absorbed in every work. From his early years he devotes his labors to God and the good of his neighbor. In the Pontificate the same dedication and the same labor for the good of mankind marks his efforts. Careful, thoughtful, devoid of that momentary enthusiasm which people sought in a Pope, cautious in the use of words, gentle in persuasion and long suffering, he was unique amongst the great men of his day. He believed in human beings and waited until their fury or madness would pass away in order that he might make appeal to their better reason. In this he was mostly successful: with France alone his failing health brought him to death before his patience had conquered the aberrations of its rulers.

A recent publication has it that "Leo XIII. played with the surface of things, and the results he obtained were superficial." It would be rash to predict what may happen in the future, but the voice of the world at his death and the genuine feeling expressed concerning the quality and extent of his work do not seem to justify the statement. For the moment the coming of the new Pope has occupied the thoughts of men, but when the preoccupation of the present time passes and the minds of men begin to measure the character and life work of Leo XIII., it is not improbable that he will be ranged among the great ones of the glorious line of Pontiffs that have ruled the Church of Christ.

P. L. Connellan.

Rome, Italy.

IRELAND IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY.

IT WAS after an interval of twenty years that the writer of these remarks revisited Ireland this past summer. It was nearly as many before since he first quitted his native land to begin the struggle of life in a distant one. Return, under such circumstances, calls up naturally the question how much has the country and its people changed during the last generation. There is a singular awaking of boyhood recollections when one returns to his native country after a prolonged absence. The scenery, the general ways of life, even the buildings and streets in the towns are almost unchanged, but the actors in the life around are all new, though somehow bearing a closer resemblance to the friends of early life now long passed away than the populations with whom one has since grown familiar by daily intercourse and later connections. The question inevitably forces itself on the returning Irishman whether the new generation has advanced, morally, intellectually and materially, beyond the generation of Irishmen which was young with himself more than twenty golden years ago. Further, he is drawn to compare the Ireland he finds himself in to-day with other lands at present whose condition is even more familiar to him than the recollections of young manhood in his native land.

On the last point, the comparison between the conditions of life in Ireland and in America or England it is hard to give an opinion in few words, though many visitors have no difficulty in attempting the task. In material wealth, in public works and buildings and the hum of commercial activity modern Ireland is far indeed behind New York or Pennsylvania or California. The older parts of Dublin and Cork or Limerick have scarcely changed their appearance in forty years; indeed, their principal buildings date back yet beyond the century just ended. An examination of the numerous public edifices of Dublin, its courts of law, its custom house, its national bank, its cathedrals reveals the strange fact that more than nine-tenths of those in the first class date from the eighteenth cenury, before the Union. The General Post Office, the National Gallery and library buildings and those of the new Royal University are almost the only public buildings erected in Dublin during the last fifty years. The churches, convents and hospitals are not included in this class, which refers only to the municipal or State erections. It is a strange comment on the effects of the Union on Irish governmental activity during the past century.

There has certainly been a large amount of private building done in Dublin and Belfast and to a lesser extent in Cork during the last

fifty years, but it is chiefly in the way of additions to the older business towns, which themselves have been but little changed. The whole amount, if judged by the expenditure of labor and material, is singularly small when compared with any American city of the population of Dublin alone.

In manufactures and business activity the contrast is even more noticeable between America and Ireland. There is a fair amount of business activity in the streets of the larger cities, but few great establishments and fewer manufactures. One is struck by the number of foreign agencies in the business streets, and also by the numerous deserted factories and mills, through the south especially, which point to former industries gone out of existence. There is little evidence of new ones arising to take their place, and, generally speaking, the commercial prosperity of Ireland, compared with that of most American communities, is small indeed.

However, man does not live by bread alone, and there are deeper interests in human life than commerce or the production of wealth. One is struck at landing in Cork or Dublin from America by the cheerful and contented look on most faces. The working men may be poorer than their brethren in America or England, but if their faces can be trusted they seem decidedly happier. One notes almost none of the hard, dogged look so common in the streets of New York or Chicago or that fierce discontent which is seen everywhere in other countries on the features of a large part of the city population. If a dinner of herbs with content be better than a stalled ox and contention therewith, then assuredly the life of the Irish people is better than that of most others. A fine Sunday in Dublin is a revelation of orderly enjoyment on the part of all classes that can hardly be paralleled elsewhere. Quarreling and rowdyism seem unknown, though the interest in outdoor sports is of the keenest. The general kindly civility of the population is remarkable, and especially the absence of the profanity and indecency in speech which one hears so constantly in American cities.

The readiness of the whole population to take interest in sports and festivals is remarkable. I arrived at a country town of a couple of thousand inhabitants on the day of the motor international race. Almost the whole male population had gone thirteen miles away to see it, including the entire police force. The stores and even the banks were closed as if on Sunday, and even the extra porter who hauled luggage usually from the railroad depot had absented himself to see the race. It should be added that there was no betting on the result and little drinking among the lookers on. They found ample enjoyment in watching the start and whir of the automobiles, and most of the young men in the town rose at three in the morning

and cheerfully walked thirteen miles for the sake of watching them.

It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that all classes in Ireland get more happiness out of life than the more highly paid population of America does. The two shillings a day of the Irish laborer furnishes more content and less worry than the two dollars of the New England factory operative or the forty cents an hour of the New York longshoreman. A like spirit runs through all classes. If millionaires are few and far between, so are the aspirations for millions to spend, and really the human happiness of most Irishmen who have an income of four or five hundred pounds seems decidedly larger than that of most wealthy Americans. The painful feature of modern Irish life to a stranger is that even the very moderate requirements of its people seem to be impossible of attainment. Most of them are desirous to remain at home if they could find employment at even the existing rates, but though the population has fallen nearly a half in fifty-five years, the problem how to find work at home seems as hard of solution as ever. Forty thousand emigrants left Ireland last year, while the growth of the population naturally was only twenty-four thousand. There were only twenty-three thousand marriages in all the country in that time, or five in the thousand, less than two-thirds of the rate in England, Germany or Spain. That fact indicates a special difficulty in obtaining a livelihood in Ireland, while it settles one of the pretended explanations of Irish distress lately current in English periodicals, namely, that it was due to reckless early marriages. As a matter of fact, less than two per cent. of the marriages in Ireland last year were contracted by minors under twenty-one.

The causes of this small number of marriages in Ireland are easily understood. About half the population, over four hundred thousand families, are farmers, who cultivate land that in a sense is their own, subject to heavy rent and taxation. Most of the farms give nothing more than bare support to the occupiers and their families. There is no chance to find holdings for grown-up sons or daughters who desire to marry and live as farmers like their parents. The work of extra hands under existing conditions gives no result in money to the family, and the sons of the farm holders have no opening to earn outside. Few care to work for others, as it involves a kind of social degradation which is keenly dreaded. The wages of the ordinary farm laborers besides scarcely average ten shillings a week and offer no inducement to compensate for this loss of social respect. The grown-up children of farmers have, therefore, no choice but to emigrate or pass their lives in idleness or unpaid work at home.

The farm laborers who own no land are probably about half the

number of the farm owners. The wages paid them have risen somewhat in late years, but still are extremely low. There has been a marked change both in the housing and dietary of this class during the last forty years. The houses erected by the local authorities and rented at cost are a great improvement on the mud cabins which sheltered the last generation, but there are not enough by any means for all the laborers. The change in food has been largely to tea and American bacon of poor quality from the old routine of potatoes, oatmeal and milk. It is more than doubtful whether it is really an improvement in point of health and strength-giving qualities. The wages of laborers are so small as to offer no chance of rising from the condition of day laborer, and so the toilers continue to swell the tide of emigrants.

It should be borne in mind that the migration of the farming population to city life is not peculiar to Ireland. It is noticed as well in England, Germany and America, but it does not carry the migrants out of their own country as it does in Ireland. The absence of manufacturing or commercial industries in the country itself deprives the Irish farmer or farm hand of any chance of other employment except at the price of expatriation. The factories that exist are already supplied with operatives, and few new ones have been begun. The shipbuilding and linen trade of Ulster, the tweeds and serges of Munster and the other Irish manufactures are too small to supply work for surplus farm labor from the country. At most they can barely provide work for those already engaged in them. Irish manufactures, like the Irish population, have been steadily dwindling during the last sixty years, and in fact their decay began somewhat earlier. Everywhere through the land one notes deserted mills and factories. The shipyards of Dublin and Portlaw, which once gave employment to thousands, are now deserted. In every Irish city one finds the larger part of the business controlled by foreign agencies. Even in the limited manufacturing industries which still exist many of the most important put a ban on the employment of Irishmen, if Catholics, in any important position. In the great Dublin brewery of Guinness & Co., the largest in the United Kingdom, scarcely a Catholic can be found in any position above that of a laborer. Admission even to the ranks of the latter class is mainly by "influence" on the part of friends of the management. It is as hard to obtain work as a brewery porter in Dublin as to get a position on the New York or San Francisco police force. The same statement may be made of most of the Irish railroads, the directors of which look with undisguised dislike on the "Common Irish Catholic." In the Great Southern and Western Railroad, the largest in Ireland, and one which derives its revenue

from a population of which nine-tenths are Catholics, ninety-five per cent. of the positions drawing salaries of over five hundred dollars annually are filled by Protestants appointed by "influence" of their co-religionists in the directorate. In the shipyards of Harland & Wolfe, in Belfast, scarcely a dozen of Catholics can be found among the several thousand ship mechanics employed. Remembering that one-third of the population of Belfast itself are Catholics, one may appreciate the intolerance of the "ascendancy" class which even now largely dominates the administration of the law, the management of the land, the commerce, the manufactures and the higher education of the Irish people.

The prospects for young Irish Catholics of a higher social position are scarcely brighter in their way than those of the agricultural population. They are barred from a large part of the great business establishments by the same bigotry which refuses a Catholic shipwright the chance to drive a rivet or turn a lathe in Messrs. Harland's yards. The professions offer a surprisingly small field in Ireland compared with America or England. A recent return showed the total number of medical practitioners at little over thirty-two hundred in a population as large as that of Pennsylvania. It is safe to say an American community would give profitable employment to eight times the number. Nevertheless the average incomes of Irish doctors are very small. About a thousand are employed as dispensary and workhouse doctors, the appointments to these positions being made by the local County Councils. The competition for most of them is very keen, and it needs much local influence as well as a regular diploma to attain one. Yet the salaries are usually only six hundred dollars a year. For this not only attendance at the institution on stated days, but also visits to all the indigent sick who obtain tickets from the relieving officer are required. The scale of remuneration provided for such duties is a good comment on the general poverty of the community and may explain the exodus of educated as well as uneducated Irishmen from Ireland to-day.

The legal profession, if exercised without government appointments of some kind, is even less promising than the medical. The courts are almost empty of business, and it is suggestive to visit the Four Courts any day and note the petty character of the disputes which occupy the twelve Superior Judges whose salaries average twenty thousand dollars each. It looks as though the whole amount of the civil claims adjudicated in each year were less than the amounts paid to the judges alone. The number of legal appointments of all kinds—Chancellor, Judges, Masters of the Rolls, County Judges, Resident Magistrates, Registrars, Commissioners and

others—is enormous compared with the actual legal requirements of the people. Those offices, however, are all in the gift of the English administration and are only to be got by renouncing all show of national patriotism. To win a profitable income at the bar by simple talent seems almost impossible in Ireland to-day. It is certainly much rarer than it was fifty or a hundred years ago, and the professional character of the Irish Bar has fallen accordingly. Still the cost of admission either to the legal or medical profession in Ireland is higher both in time and money than anywhere in the United States. Whether this be an evil or a good it is not necessary to discuss here. It is only mentioned as an illustration of the difficulties in the way of finding employment which confront Irishmen of the present day in Ireland more than in other lands.

Outside the professions there seems hardly any opening in Ireland to-day for young men of higher education. Engineering works are mainly under government control or that of corporations like the railroads whose intolerance bars Catholics from employment. It must be recollected that as Ireland is a Catholic country, more than three-quarters of its population are practically under ban of the powers that be in public work of all kinds. The powers recently acquired by the elected County Councils have opened the appointments to local offices such as the County Surveyors to Catholics, but until recently the Grand Juries controlled them in a spirit of all but absolute intolerance. It will need some years to train even the limited number who can hope to obtain a share in these offices. Architecture offers some, but only a limited field, for educated work, but in it, too, the public works are not, in any appreciable degree, to be looked for by Irishmen. For art or literature as profitable professions there has been literally no encouragement in Ireland during the last forty years. Such as elect to pursue them as a means of living are forced to emigrate of necessity. The press alone furnishes some employment, but it is not of a character to attract bright intellects in any number. A journal of the standing of the old Dublin *Nation* would be impossible in Ireland at the present moment.

The teaching profession is even less attractive in its rewards than those already mentioned. Trinity College, with its estates drawn from the public property of a value of nearly two hundred thousand dollars a year, is in the hands of the Episcopalian body, which numbers at most an eighth part of the Irish population. The three Queen's Colleges are government institutions, appointments in which, as in the legal profession, are determined by official favor rather than intellectual merit. Belfast College, the largest of the three, has been practically handed over to the control of the Presby-

terian General Assembly. For forty years after its foundation no Catholic was allowed to hold a chair in it, with one exception. That was the chair of Irish language, which was maintained on the munificent salary of one hundred pounds a year as a generous concession of the English administration. The three and a half millions of Irish Catholics have no institution that can be called a university. A limited number of fellowships in the State Board of Examiners known as the Royal University are the only positions open to them except the very small chance of professorships in the Queen's Colleges or Trinity. These are almost the only openings for Irishmen who desire to devote their energies to scientific or literary studies such as occupy thousands in the universities of England or the continental countries of Europe. The body of national teachers cannot aspire to an income of over three hundred dollars a year, and most of them receive very much less. The higher paid members of the educational body as inspectors, normal school professors and commissioners are all appointed by the government Board of Education. Their first appointments are to a degree competitive, but their subsequent promotion is largely dependent on political obsequiousness. It is hardly needed to say that anything like original thought on educational matters would be fatal to the personal prospects of an inspector or normal school principal.

The whole matter of public education is indeed one of the most important points to be settled in Ireland at present. The schools have been the field in which the last struggle of British statesmen to change the religion of the Irish people to modified British models has been fought. During the penal laws all literary instruction was absolutely forbidden to Irish Catholics. After the Union a system of State aided schools, known as the Kildare Place Society, was devised and received a few thousand pounds annually from the Treasury. There was no system of examination of the teachers, and Catholic as well as Protestant teachers could receive grants for teaching, but the reading of the Scriptures was obligatory in every school, "without note or comment." The Irish Catholics after a short time decided not to sanction this practice. In consequence Lord Stanley prepared a new scheme in 1836, which has been, with modifications, the law of primary schooling in Ireland since that time. It provided aid from the public funds for all schools having a certain number of pupils which could come up to the standard of examinations required by a newly formed Board of National Education. The Board consisted of seven members appointed by the administration, one of them receiving a salary and being practical manager of the policy of the Board. As four-fifths of the population were Catholics, Lord Stanley proposed that only secular instruc-

tion should be dealt with by the Board, but that religious teaching should be given separately to each denomination by its own clergy. The grant for public education was only sufficient to pay very small salaries to the teachers, and at first the providing school houses was left to local private efforts. Each school was to have a local manager, who when recognized as such had the appointing or dismissal of the teachers and the general control of the school building. The Government Board claimed the regulation of the studies, the books used and general compliance with their rules. On these conditions they allotted salaries to the teachers, according to their classification, which was determined by the Board's inspectors. The supply of books at low rates and grants in aid of school buildings were other features of the system of Lord Stanley.

At a later period the Board advanced funds for building new schools which were to be more under its own control. It added a system of district model schools in which the teachers were appointed by its own officials and also normal schools for training teachers under professors and superintendents of its own appointment. Either might have been helpful in improving Irish schooling if honestly carried out, but in practice the policy of the Board for many years was directed to introducing English and Protestant ideas among the Irish Catholic peasantry much more than to developing their intellects. Dr. Whately, the English Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, was one of the early commissioners, and he dominated the Board in virtue of his position for nearly twenty years. He used his influence to introduce various semi-religious tracts of his own among the Irish children, and the secular textbooks were also prepared under his guidance. All reference to Irish ideas and even to Ireland was carefully excluded from the school books thus prepared. A curious illustration of English ideas of impartial treatment for Irish Catholics was given by the constitution of the original Board. It consisted of seven members, two of whom were Catholics, to protect the interests of seven millions of Catholics, and five Protestants, to ensure justice for the million and a half of Irish Protestants.

The first Resident Commissioner selected to form a satisfactory educational system for the Irish Catholic people was the Rev. Mr. Carlisle, a Presbyterian clergyman, whose qualifications rested on the fact that he had conducted a strictly Presbyterian academy for some years in Dublin. The ushers employed in this academy were named as first directors of the normal school provided by the State to form teachers for the Irish Catholic people. They also were deputed to form the school books on which their educational training was to be moulded. The spirit in which their task was carried out may

be guessed at from the fact that scarcely a reference to Irish history or character is to be found in the so-called "National" school books. Even the well-known song of Lover, "The Angels Whisper," which appeared in an early edition of one of the readers, was eliminated as savoring too much of "Popish superstition," though written by a Protestant poet.

Though the efforts of the Catholic hierarchy and the attachment of the people to their faith have baffled the hopes of Archbishop Whately of "sapping the vast edifice of the Church through the national school system," the effects of the constant supervision of anti-national authorities over the public schools has had a very marked effect in dwarfing the intellectual development of the Irish people during the last fifty years. A knowledge of reading and writing has been widely diffused indeed. During the last year nine-tenths of the persons married in Ireland were familiar with writing, as against half the number fifty years ago; but the results of the school system seem to have gone no further. Technical education, which has been so useful on the European continent in training the people to the ways of making a livelihood, is almost unknown in the Irish national school system. The number of pupils who go through the higher grades is extremely small, and there are scarcely any facilities in most parts of the country for using the faculties of reading and writing acquired at school. Irish education emphatically needs reform in all its branches, from the national primary school to the universities. Such reform, to be effective, can only be carried out by the Irish people itself on its own ideals. The control of Irish education by the Irish people is at least as important for their welfare as emancipation from the English land system.

The changes in administration made during recent years by the formation of elected County Councils to replace the former Grand Juries of landlords has undoubtedly had a good effect in training the people to practical business methods in the management of their own affairs. The action of the Councils, however, is still largely controlled by irresponsible bodies named at discretion by the English Ministry, and the members of which are, for the most part, distinctly hostile to Irish nationality. It is to be hoped that from the exercise even of such limited governmental powers the people may soon rise to control of their own schools. The whole system of boards appointed by the English administration to control Irish local administration, education, public works, police and commerce must be swept away before any real progress can be looked for in Ireland. The settlement of the question between landlords and tenants which has been attempted this year is of much less real importance than

the removal of the strings on national development caused by these hostile Government Boards. Full control of the national education by the Irish people itself is, we believe, of far more vital importance than the land bill.

The truth of this assertion can hardly be denied in view of the causes which are steadily driving the Irish agricultural population out of Ireland under existing conditions. The reduction in actual burthens of rent promised by the land bill just signed will be at most twenty-five per cent. on the existing rents. Such an amount is altogether insufficient to keep the young farmers and farm laborers at home. It can only be done by the diffusion of practical education, by the cultivation of business training, the development of Irish manufactures and the regulation of Irish commerce and railroads to the end of enabling the Irish people to live and increase in their own land. Education wisely devised alone can solve these questions. They cannot be solved by any acts of Parliament, but they may be solved by the intelligence of the Irish people when freed from the fetters which have so long cramped it.

There appears no real reason why the Irish people, if not misgoverned, should not increase and prosper at home. The soil is as fertile as that of most lands, the facilities for commerce greater than of almost any of the same size. The race showed its capacity for manufactures amply during even the limited part of the eighteenth century when self rule was accompanied with a partial relaxation of the old intolerance which made slaves of three-fourths of the population as Catholics. The causes of the depopulation of the last sixty years cannot be found either in the capacity of the country to support a much larger population or that of its people to develop its resources if left to their freedom. The density of population in Ireland to-day is less than that of most European lands. Belgium supports without difficulty seven millions of people on a territory less than one-third of Ireland, yet the latter finds it hard to give work to less than five millions. Ireland is the one country in the civilized world whose population is dwindling, and it has been diminishing without respite for nearly sixty years. The first census taken after the accession of the late Queen Victoria gave Ireland over eight millions of people, while England had but fifteen and Scotland less than three millions. To-day Scotland exceeds Ireland in population and England and Wales reckon nearly seven times as many inhabitants. Roughly reckoning, when Victoria ascended the throne the Irish formed one-third of the population of the British Islands. To-day those in Ireland are scarcely one-eighth of the total. The growth on one side of the Irish Sea and the decrease on the other have been going on for well nigh sixty years, and they still

continue. Until that condition ceases it is idle to speak of any prosperity for Ireland or the Irish people within its borders.

What makes the depopulation of Ireland more remarkable is that every other European land has steadily gained during the last sixty years. Switzerland, Belgium, Germany, Italy, Spain, Russia and even Turkey are all more populous now than fifty years ago. Even the so-called Kingdom of Poland, which shares with Ireland the disadvantages of foreign rule, has doubled its population and more than quadrupled its wealth since 1841. Ireland then numbered eight millions and Poland little over four. At the present day the Kingdom of Poland has eight millions and Ireland less than five. The Polish provinces under Prussian rule have nearly doubled their population in the same period, despite of hostile legislation on the part of their German rulers and very considerable emigration. Even the Christian provinces under the Sultan's rule in Europe have grown in inhabitants, while Ireland is being depopulated during a continuous period of more than fifty years.

The decay has never ceased since it began in the time of the potato failure in 1846. The last census had shown eight million two hundred thousand inhabitants of Ireland, and at the same rate of increase as in the former decade they must have grown to much over eight and a half millions by the close of 1845. The disease which suddenly attacked a single vegetable product wiped a quarter of the population of Ireland from their country in five years. The census of 1851 showed six and a half millions as the total remaining in Ireland at that time. The *Times*, the organ par excellence of English public opinion, at the time summed up the destruction with the comment: "The Celts are gone—gone with a vengeance." The language is worth remembering. It gives a key to understanding the spirit of humanitarian feeling which prevailed and still prevails in the governing class in Great Britain.

The famine caused by the potato disease continued three years, but its cessation with 1848 brought no stop to the decrease in the population of Ireland. It had fallen to six and a half millions in 1851; it was only five and three-quarter millions in 1861, five and a half in 1871, five millions one hundred and fifty thousand in 1881, under five millions at the close of the next decade and little over four and a half millions at the close of the century. The decrease still continues, and one of the characteristic scenes of Irish life witnessed by King Edward on his last visit to Cork was the departure of a tug from Queenstown laden with Irish emigrants for the United States. The King is said to have been much struck by the sight. At his departure from Ireland he generously bestowed a thousand pounds for relief of the poor of the Irish capital as a token of his

practical sympathy with his Irish subjects and their wants. Two weeks later Mr. Andrew Carnegie presented twenty-eight thousand as a gift to the city of Dublin for a public library. The munificence of British royalty was, we are assured, keenly appreciated in Ireland. The decrease of its population, however, still continues.

Besides this munificent personal gift, King Edward at the close of his visit issued a friendly address to his Irish subjects. In it he urged the value of self-reliance among the class in question as the best means of remedying the lack of general prosperity which had been presented to his eyes in Ireland as compared with Great Britain. There is always something comic in the lectures of high placed personages on the remedies for poverty. The French Princess who wondered why the country people should die in a famine rather than live on bread and cheese is a fair parallel to the well meant exhortation of the British monarch to his Irish subjects. The cultivation of self-reliance as an intellectual character will hardly enable a captive to work with both hands tied behind him. The difficulties which beset the finding of fit employment for all classes of the Irish people are mainly material obstacles imposed by the effects of foreign legislation and unfriendly administration. The first object which Irish self-reliance aims at is the power to control its own action, and that is precisely what English government denies it by main force. When four-fifths of the Irish people seek to form their system of public education on the lines they deem best suited for national development they are confronted by a hostile majority in Parliament which denies them university training on any system but that which it thinks suitable. The primary schools are dominated by a handful of ministerial dependents, who forbid any attempt to change the methods of instruction which they think best fitted to prevent the growth of any free national spirit. Do the County Councils elected by the people desire to inaugurate public works from the people's money or to house the poor in a suitable manner the Local Government Board forbids any expenditure for such ends without its sovereign permission, which is often refused without explanation. Are public funds to be expended for national purposes concerning the whole island, for drainage works, canals, piers or harbors, an irresponsible Board of Works, whose incapacity is even greater than its arrogance, takes charge of the whole matter and builds harbors on the sands above low water mark, like one lately near Dublin. The whole general revenue raised from Ireland is controlled by the British administration, not by the Irish people. Its amount has been steadily raised year after year since the famine, almost inversely with the decrease of the population. In 1853 the imperial taxation of Ireland was four million pounds, when the pop-

ulation numbered six and a half millions. To-day it is nearly ten million pounds, while the people have dwindled to four and a half millions. At the beginning of the Crimean War the imperial taxation was about fourteen shillings on each individual; and even then the country was steadily perishing under burthens beyond its resources. To-day the taxation has risen to nearly two pounds five shillings, or three times what it was fifty years ago. And the demand for relief of the Irish people is only met with an increased constabulary force and a coercion act which leaves their personal liberty absolutely at the mercy of the British Viceroy. To recommend self-reliance as the cure for such a condition of practical politics recalls the worthy in Huckleberry Finn's experience who "charged nothing for the preaching he gave the neighbors, and it was worth it, too."

The lack of capital in Ireland as compared with other English-speaking countries is undoubtedly a leading cause of the lack of employment, which renders it impossible for so many Irishmen to find a livelihood at home. The excessive taxation imposed by England is without question the chief cause of that poverty in Ireland generally. About three-fourths of the ten odd million pounds raised for imperial taxation is yearly carried out of the island without any return. There is promise of a bonus of twelve million pounds in the land bill this year for the purpose of inducing the landlord class to end the system of land tenure introduced into Ireland by English law. Even the more sober part of the English public speak of this as a measure of national generosity of England to Ireland, like the vote for the purchase of the slaves of the West Indies sixty-five years ago. As a simple matter of fact, the English treasury has drawn ten fold that amount from Ireland during the last twenty years, during which the land legislation has been the subject of practical reforms. The financial relief which the bill promises to the Irish farming class is at most about a reduction of seven million dollars annually in their rents. About five times that amount continues to be yearly drawn from the impoverished country for the expenditures of the English Government in every other part of the world. Can any real return of prosperity to Ireland be looked for from the new legislation under such conditions?

It is not a pleasant task to point out the true condition of affairs in Ireland to-day, to note how decay continues in its population, its wealth and even in its intellectual development, but it is absolutely necessary to know the evil before one can pretend to find its remedy. It is a common charge against the Irish people that they waste their energies on political discussion when they would be better employed in developing the material resources of their coun-

try. To an observer on the spot it is evident that political effort is absolutely necessary before any material development can be attained. The crushing weight of taxation can only be removed by political action. The formation of a suitable educational system can only be removed by political action. The facilities for extending manufactures and commerce and protecting nascent industries must be worked for by political action. Parliamentary debates, election machinery, public speeches and gatherings are not very inspiring work, but they are still an absolute necessity for the Irish people if it is to continue to exist in its present home.

In what may be called the social and moral aspect the condition of Ireland is much more satisfactory than in the material one. Though poor the country is free from crime to an extent unknown elsewhere in the civilized world. The total number of penitentiary or State prison convicts is only about five hundred in the four and a half millions. There is but one such to every nine thousand individuals. The proportion in the United States last year was more than ten times that amount. During the last two months only two homicides have occurred throughout Ireland. One was the act of a lunatic, the other of an English soldier who came over expressly to commit it. In about half the counties absolutely no crime has been brought before the courts. It seems that during the preceding three months there was no case of murder or homicide in the whole country.

The proportion of illegitimate to legitimate births, as told by the Registrar General, for the last year is equally noteworthy. The percentage is two and a half per cent., or about one-third that of England. Drunkenness is not common either in city or country, and agrarian quarrels have almost ceased. The constabulary returns for the three months ending the day of my arrival gave the following curious figures for the whole country's record. It should be added that they deal not with crimes proved in court, but merely incidents reported by the police as possibly such. The list of possible offenses is a long one. It enumerates murder, homicide, firing at the person, inciting to kill, poisoning, conspiracy to murder, cutting or maiming, cattle stealing, highway robbery, burglary, sacrilege, perjury, conspiracy and attempted extortion. No case of any of these was reported among the whole population of Ireland during three months. The total docket of agrarian crime for that time in a population nearly that of Pennsylvania consisted of twenty-nine threatening anonymous letters, six charges of malicious mischief, six alleged incendiary fires of the same class, six ordinary battery charges. One case was reported of each of the following: Assault on police, firing at a dwelling, assault with deadly weapon and taking

forcible possession of premises. It may be well asked what population elsewhere can show such a record?

The comparison between the lists of crime in Ireland and the number of guardians of the peace which the government deems requisite to maintain order is absolutely comic. Dublin, with the same population approximately as San Francisco, has just three times its police force. The latter has four hundred, Dublin eleven hundred. The constabulary through the rest of the country number twelve thousand, or about the same proportion for a crimeless rural population as for a crowded city. The difficulty in killing time of the official guardians of the peace is ludicrous when they are not deliberately employed in some work of petty persecution ordered by the Castle authorities. I was in a Tipperary town in July on a fair day, and passing the constabulary barrack I noticed a dozen able bodied men in uniforms engaged at midday in casting shoulder weights in their back yard. Their presence was wholly needless in the fair itself. The cost to the Irish people of this valuable body is over five million dollars annually. One-sixth of the number would be ample for all practical purposes, and the four million dollars expended on them would more than maintain the whole indigent population now supported by the Irish rate payers from their small earnings. The cost of the constabulary is much greater than the whole amount now spent on public education in Ireland.

In face of the figures just given it is needless to seek the cause of the present decadence of material prosperity in Ireland in the moral character of the people or their indulgence in drink, as some narrow though well meaning individuals are in the habit of doing in America. The simple fact is that the ruling class in the British Empire are still bent on maintaining a system of control over every branch of Irish government in their own hands. That system was avowedly framed to prevent Irish interests from thriving to any extent dangerous to those of England, commercial or political. During more than two hundred years successive rulers of England tried to force the religious system devised to further English political theories on the Catholic population of Ireland. The trial was exceptionally severe on the latter, but they held their religious faith all through it, though the English Catholics, who were nearly half the population at the accession of James Stuart, gradually abandoned theirs. The dominant ideas in the English governing class are now little concerned with religion in any shape. They are likewise much changed as regards the value of military glory or feudal supremacy over subject nations. Mammon has risen above Moloch as the national deity of the empire, and its interests are now mainly his own. The real motive for the interference of English statesmen

in the government of Ireland is to draw as much money as possible from the latter and prevent her people interfering with the commercial interests of England by competition. The programme has been carried out so thoroughly that it is well nigh impossible for the population of Ireland even to live under its burthens. If they are to exist, they must shake off the yoke, and though the task is a hard one, it is not harder than the maintenance of their religion through the penal laws.

It is necessary, however, to find the weapons with which the contest has to be fought. It is not now a question of arms and military discipline, but one of knowledge and thorough training in the ways and secrets of business life. That does not mean that Irish ideals and Irish faith are to be cast aside as incompatible with business success. It means that secular knowledge, close business training and intelligent coöperation for business ends of all classes in Ireland must henceforth be part of Ireland's national programme. The relations in those respects between the English and Irish population to-day are not unlike those between the trained soldiers of the Turkish Sultans of old and the inheritors of Christianity and Greek civilization in the remnant of the Roman Empire. The higher race morally and intellectually went down to slavery to the lower in all but skill in weapons and military discipline. The business knowledge and habits of the present day must be learned by the Irish people to a more thorough degree than they now possess them. The task, it would seem, will largely be one of education and determination, and its accomplishment is within the reach of the people's power even now.

Bryan J. Clinch.

Dublin.

THE TRAINING OF THE TEACHER.

THE rise and development of the parochial school system is a phenomenon which has of late years been attracting more and more of the attention of non-Catholic educators. Meetings of educational bodies, as well as educational journals, to say nothing of the popular press, furnish evidence of how closely our schools are being studied, and of how keenly felt is their claim to effective rivalry of the public schools. The phenomenon, even apart from the religious question involved, is indeed striking enough to elicit the attention and earnest study of all who are

sincerely interested in the progress of popular education. It may be questioned if the history of education affords an example of the development of a system of schools on so comprehensive a scale, in so short a period of time and in the face of difficulties so real and so great. The parochial school system of to-day is practically a creation of the past fifty years. Instead of the few scattered parish schools existing at the middle of the last century, there are now many thousands of schools, organized on a national plan, and to be found in every State and Territory and in almost every city and town. The handful of teachers—many of them of the most makeshift character—has grown into a great army of trained religious, consecrating to the work of Christian education all the energies of their noble and unselfish lives. The primitive log cabins or cheerless frame houses wherein our fathers received their simple lessons have given place to ornamental and commodious buildings of brick or stone. The few thousands of Catholic school children have increased to almost a million. In some dioceses practically the enire Catholic population of elementary school age is enrolled in the parochial schools. Throughout the country as a whole, one-half the Catholic population of school age attends Catholic schools of one kind or another. If we take into account the fact that fully one-half the public school enrollment is for rural districts, and the further fact that Catholics who live in rural districts cannot be expected as yet, from the nature of the circumstances, to provide separate schools, it will be seen that the great body of Catholics in cities and towns are loyally supporting the parochial schools and faithfully sending their children to them.

American Catholics are, relatively speaking, poor. Comparatively few of them have been, up to the present, blessed with a superabundance of the goods of this world. Yet they have spent more money, and are spending more money to-day, on popular education than any other denomination or class of citizens. Of the school taxes, which have grown so great and burdensome that it has become a matter of the utmost difficulty to get legislatures to increase them further, notwithstanding the fact that multitudes of children in our great cities are left without proper school facilities, Catholics pay their full share, although they are unable conscientiously to make use of those common educational agencies to which they are thereby entitled. In addition to this, they are paying half as much again for the purpose of giving their children such an education as they deem indispensable for right living and good citizenship. The actual expenditure on the parochial schools of New York city during the past year, including the cost of maintenance and the interest on property investment, averaged thirteen dollars per capita of school

attendance.[1] On the basis of this average, the parochial schools throughout the entire country would have cost during the same period about twelve million dollars; and, on the same basis, the expenditure on parochial schools during the past twenty years would be in the neighborhood of two hundred millions of dollars. This does not include the cost of buildings or property. A rough estimate gives a total of one hundred and thirty millions as the present value of school buildings and property. We may, therefore, reckon the total amount of money Catholics have spent on the parochial schools during the past twenty years to be well over three hundred millions of dollars. And most of this vast sum has come out of the pockets of those whose economic condition makes them painfully conscious of the burdens of taxation imposed for the support of the public schools.

But there is another side to this educational development, one which, even more than the remarkable features of numerical growth and financial outlay, is calculated to attract the attention of non-Catholic educators. The progress of the parochial schools has been qualitative as well as quantitative. Catholic teachers have, in general, been prompt to avail themselves of the aid of whatever light the science of education has been able to shed upon the difficult and delicate task of getting the child to make aright his first formal advances in the way of knowledge. The Catholic parochial school —the typical school, of course, is meant—is no longer wedded to the theory of the "Three R's," or to exclusively Aristotelian methods of teaching. Our best parochial schools are to-day teaching algebra and geometry in the upper grades, and have graded courses in drawing and experimental science all through the elementary years. The view that the child can best attain to his first conscious notions of number, of language and of art, as well as of science, through the medium of external objects, and that consequently the whole process of mental training ought to be based upon the observation of these, has effected a revolution in the methods of elementary teaching, and nowhere do the results more clearly indicate the change to be one of real progress than in the parochial school. It is, in fact, no longer possible to differentiate the work of the parochial school from that of the public school on the ground either of the curriculum of secular studies or of the character of the methods employed. This condition makes the real question at issue between the two systems of education stand out more clearly, and it ought to make it easier, as time goes on, for those who attempt to study the practical workings of two systems, to recognize the soundness of the

[1] Diocesan School Report, *Catholic World*, Jan., 1903.

Catholic position as to the necessity of religious instruction in the school.

These facts furnish the surest guarantee that a settlement of the vexed school question must eventually be arrived at which will lift from the shoulders of Catholics and those of other denominations who have separate schools the grievous burdens of double taxation they have now to bear. "The school question," says Bishop Spalding, "if it be ever settled at all, will be settled by facts." The strongest argument in favor of the Catholic school ought to be the school itself. The parochial school system as it actually exists, with its great disciplined organizations of teachers, with almost a million pupils, with hundreds of millions of dollars invested in school property, together with the visibly beneficent influence of the vast educational scheme upon the entire Catholic body, is doing more than all the arguments of our apologists to impress the non-Catholic mind with a sense of the justice of the Catholic position on the school question. And if the parochial school system were twice as strong, numerically, financially and in efficiency, our position would be, in the eyes of the public, fully twice as strong.

The efficiency of the school is directly proportionate to the character and equipment of the teacher. To gauge the value of an educational system it is only necessary to ascertain the character, the standards and the methods of its teachers' training schools. If we are to convince the world that our schools are as good as others, we must be prepared to show, first of all, that our teachers are equally as good. If the parochial schools are to continue to keep abreast of the public schools, the institutions in which our teachers are trained must be the object of unceasing efforts to correct defects and to assimilate new elements of educative power. The teacher, from whatever point we may view the matter, must be regarded as the dominant factor in the problem of the future of our schools.

Such was evidently the conviction of the Fathers of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore. After insisting upon the duty of providing Catholic schools, whenever possible, and of making them such as to be "in no wise inferior to the public schools," they go on to point out the means by which the parochial schools may be brought to that "state of efficiency and perfection which the honor of the Church, the interests of the pupil, temporal as well as eternal, and the generous loyalty of the laity unquestionably demand and deserve." Chief among these means they place the training of the teacher. "Since the condition and growth of our schools depends principally upon the quality of the teachers, the greatest care must be taken that none but those who are thoroughly qualified should be permitted to teach." Accordingly they prescribe, as a rule to

be everywhere observed, that each candidate must give proof, in a fair examination, of sufficient ability and training before being given a license to teach. The Council strongly urges the erection of normal schools for both lay and religious teachers, and recommends that the curriculum embrace all that the candidate may be expected to teach, as well as all that educational science and experience can tell as to the best methods of teaching. It desires especially that the teachers in these normal schools shall be themselves competent for their work. They are to unite to great natural ability a mastery of not only the academic branches, but also of methods, and of all that is comprised to-day under the broad title of pedagogy or the science of education. The end to be kept in view is "that the parochial schools may continue to grow stronger and more efficient, and may prove to be a source of pride, of hope and of strength to the State no less than to the Church."[2]

The idea of the professional training of the teacher had its roots in the fruitful soil of the Renaissance. The conception of education as a science followed logically from the growth of the other sciences, and its perfectibility was proved by the progress made along so many other lines of inductive inquiry. The germ of the modern normal school is first found in the professorial seminary of the Jesuit curriculum. Mulcaster, in England, advocated the professional training of teachers as early as 1581. But it was La Salle who first gave definite shape to the new theory, and embodied it in an institutional form which has remained, to a great extent, the model of all subsequent efforts in the same direction. A great impetus was given to the cause of popular education by the training school he set up at Rheims in 1681, and more especially by the religious order he established to carry on the work. In Germany the ideas of La Salle made even a deeper and more permanent impression. Francke and Hecker labored with enthusiasm to incorporate schools for the training of teachers into the slowly evolving system of Prussian national education, and with such success and excellent effects that under Frederick the Great the schools of Berlin attracted the attention of all Europe. So beneficial, in fact, were the effects seen to be that in the great educational reform which marked the rejuvenation of Prussia, after the Napoleonic wars, the normal school was definitely and permanently fixed as the central agency in the system of national primary education.

From Germany the normal school idea gradually made its way to the other countries of Europe, and eventually to America, where, previous to the time of Horace Mann, the special preparation of teachers for their work had been almost wholly neglected. So

[2] Acta et Decreta, n. 202 seq.

late as 1837 Mann was able to say of Massachusetts: "Engaged in the common schools of this State there are now, out of the city of Boston, but few more than one hundred male teachers who devote themselves to teaching as a regular profession. The number of females is a little though not materially larger. Very few even of these have ever had any special training for their vocation." It is worthy of note that the chief instrument he relied on in his work of educational reform was the establishment of teachers' training schools. The normal school he set up at Lexington in 1839 was soon followed by others. Since then the normal school has steadily grown in popular favor, as it has increased in efficiency and more clearly manifested its power as a permanently vivifying influence upon the common schools. Now every State and Territory has its public and its private normal schools, and it has come to be generally recognized that only through the perfecting of the methods of the normal school and its continued development, together with a wider application of the fundamental principles for which it stands, can we hope to add to or even maintain the progress that has been made thus far in the way of better teaching in the primary school.

The historic ideal of the normal school is based upon the recognition of a two-fold principle in education. Viewed as an objective process, which falls under the observation of the senses, teaching is a science, and its nature, scope and methods become legitimate subjects for scientific study. Viewed as a vital, personal function, teaching is an art, like music or painting, unanalizable in its essence, although its products may, like those of other arts, be measured and appraised according to standards established by reason and experience.

As to teaching, considered as a science, the normal school training embraces work along two distinct lines; the means to be made use of in educating and the methods whereby the mind of the pupil may most easily and effectively be brought into organic relationship with the means to be used. The means to be used form the subject-matters of the so-called "academic" curriculum of the normal school. They are usually the same common school studies as the candidate will be called upon later on to teach; only, in the training school, they are studied in a deeper and a broader way than in the elementary school. Grammar, for instance, is not only thoroughly reviewed, but reviewed in the light of a knowledge of literature and modern languages. Arithmetic is gone over again, and its principles illustrated by problems of greater perplexity; but it is now taught in such a way as to show its connection with algebra and geometry. Accompanying this deeper review-study is the ever present problem of how to present the matter most effectively to

the mind of the elementary pupil. To study in this way is, as Dr. Harris has pointed out, to study subjects "constructively." It is to study the subject itself, and at the same time, its educational value to the pupil. This "constructive" study of the subjects of the elementary school curriculum may be said to be the distinctive characteristic of the normal school.

Hand in hand with the "constructive" study of the academic branches, there is the study of method. As the work of the teacher is to direct and quicken the process by which the faculties of the child spontaneously unfold and develop, so the study of method, or the adaptation of means to this end, must be based upon a knowledge of the child-mind. The mind to be educated is the first and fundamental term in the educational equation, and psychology can form the only rational basis of methodolgy or the science of educational methods. By giving us a fuller and more scientific knowledge of the laws of mental growth, psychology enables us to improve upon the methods which instinct, guided by a dearly bought experience, had fixed upon and made traditional in the school. Practice had taught men how the elemental forces of nature might be made to yield light and heat, easily and conveniently, ages before the birth of chemistry and physics; but how much more easily and conveniently the same forces have been made to do the work since chemistry and physics have enabled us to understand the laws which underlay the older methods. Psychology, similarly, has already done much to lighten and illuminate the teacher's task. New methods have been introduced, while many of the older methods of teaching and discipline have been modified or altogether dropped. New light has been shed upon many problems of the school room which are still unsolved, and in the effort now being made to bring to the test of ascertained laws of mental growth such questions as examination, grading, fatigue, the relative values of individual and class instruction, and the like, we have a prospect which is full of promise for the future of elementary education.

But it is with the principles of psychology the teacher has to deal, rather than with its study as an experimental science. Psychological experimentation can have no legitimate place in the elementary school, and the too frequent disregard of this truth is responsible for much of the existing prejudice against the study of psychology in the training school. The abandonment of traditional methods merely because of their being "old fashioned," would be to go to an extreme the opposite of conservatism. All sound and genuine progress must be based upon the achievements of the past; hence the need of educational history and the important place this newly created branch of knowledge has come to occupy in the curriculum

of the normal school. The study of the history of education is calculated to give breadth of view in dealing with current problems, and to quicken the teacher's enthusiasm through acquaintance with the work and spirit of the great educators of the past. The growth of interest in this field of educational work, as evidenced by the increasing literature of the subject and the increasing emphasis put upon it in the training of the teacher, is a substantial proof that the normal school movement rests upon a firm pedagogical foundation, and that, while educators are eagerly reaching out on every side to lay hold of whatever may be of aid to the further advancement of the school, there need be no fear that any good or useful element in the successes of the past will be overlooked or lightly laid aside.

The normal school recognizes that education is an art as well as a science. Knowledge of the academic branches and of pedagogy does not necessarily imply pedagogical skill. The teacher may know enough, and yet fail through practical inability to apply his knowledge properly. Enthusiasm and high ideals cannot, of themselves, prevent the formation of habits which militate against success. The work of the normal school could not be regarded as complete if its graduates were allowed to go out from it without ever having had a chance to put its principles to the test of actual practice, and left to make their first trial of teaching under circumstances precluding the help of friendly advice or assistance. The theological student in the seminary is not only taught how to prepare and deliver sermons, but is given practice in preaching. The law student practices the art of pleading and the trial of cases. The student of medicine is made to give evidence of his ability to diagnose and operate before being allowed to start out as a physician. Why should not the teacher, whose art is certainly not less difficult or subtle than that of the preacher, the lawyer or the doctor, be given some practice in teaching as a part of his professional training? The conviction of the necessity of this has been strong from the very beginning. In connection with his training school for teachers at Paris, La Salle set up an elementary school, wherein the young masters were to be exercised in teaching under the supervision of an experienced Brother, while continuing their studies. Herbart established a similar institution at Konigsburg, in 1809, in connection with his pedagogical seminary. The growth of normal schools in our country was soon followed by the custom of requiring their students to teach in neighboring elementary schools, as a part of regular curriculum. Nearly all our public normal schools now require practice teaching, in one form or another. In the normal schools of France and Germany, as well as England, it is

regarded as an essential, and no candidate is admitted to the ranks of the professional teachers without having made trial, under competent supervision, of his fitness to carry on the actual work of the class room.

In endeavoring to determine the extent to which the training of the Catholic teacher has been influenced by the great educational movement represented by the normal school, it must be remembered that the movement was distinctly Catholic in its origin. Its essential principles were woven into the rules and constitutions of the great religious order created by the founder of the first normal school, and most of the teaching communities which have been established since are modeled more or less upon the order of La Salle. In certain important respects, as we shall see, the Catholic teaching orders respresent the most perfect development of the fundamental idea for which the normal school stands.

It must be remembered, too, that nearly all the teachers in the parochial schools to-day are members of the religious orders. In studying the growth of the parochial school system two tendencies are noticed which were evident from the very beginning, but which have become specially manifest during the last half century. One is the replacement of male teachers by women. The other is the replacement of lay teachers—both men and women—by religious. A quarter of a century ago lay teachers were quite common in the parochial schools, especially in the Middle Western States. To-day they are rarely to be found, and where they are, it is usually in the capacity of assistants to the regular teachers. The gradual disappearance of male teachers from the elementary schools seems to be due chiefly to economic causes, just as in the case of the public schools. At present less than one-twentieth of the teachers in the parochial schools are men, and even this slight proportion appears to be on the decrease. Nearly all of these belong to religious orders. Many of them are really teaching classes of high school grade in connection with parochial schools, and there is a growing tendency on the part of the teaching brotherhoods to concentrate their work in the field of secondary education. Catholic elementary education is to-day, therefore, almost entirely in the hands of the religious orders of women. These orders are very numerous. The Catholic Directory recognizes 85 distinct teaching communities of women, the combined membership of which is upward of 40,000. Some of these communities have less than 100 religious, while many are comparatively large, the largest numbering about 3,000 members. Some are diocesan, that is, their work is confined to a single diocese; but, as a rule, the establishments of each order range through a number of States, and not a few have schools in every section of the country and in almost every State.

These facts suggest two very important advantages of the Catholic teacher, as compared with the teacher in the public school. In the first place, the Catholic teacher takes up teaching as a life profession, and is, as a rule, a teacher for life. The members of each of these religious orders from a body of truly professional teachers. As religious they have bound themselves by solemn obligations to continue to teach as long as health and strength shall permit them to be of service, according to the prudent judgment of their superiors. They have deliberately shut out all prospect and all possibility, morally speaking, of a change of occupation. They have identified the highest conceivable ideal of human life with the ideal of the teaching profession. The consciousness of having engaged in teaching as a life profession, out of love for it and appreciation of its sacredness and worth, is an inexhaustible fountain of interest, of enthusiasm and of strength for the teacher; and, in the eyes of the Catholic public, this fact alone suffices to stamp the work of the teacher in the parochial school with an authority and value which no degree of personal ability could otherwise confer. Moreover, the environment of the Catholic teacher is calculated to continue the work of the training school by fostering the growth of a professional spirit, stimulating to study and broadening and enriching the teacher's educational experience. The members of the teaching orders live apart from the world, free alike from its exciting pleasures and its harassing cares. They are not bothered about salaries. They have no increase to look forward to. They receive very little, only about one-third to one-half of what public school teachers in the primary grades of city schools get, and it is only by the severe simplicity of their mode of life and the exercise of a rigid economy that they are enabled to get along.[3] They live in common, in groups varying from three to thirty, and are thus enabled to live very cheaply. Their life centres about the school, and they may be said to be never wholly out of its atmosphere. Their house is next to the school—often consisting, in fact, of a portion of the school building. The school enters into their conversations, their recreations, their prayers. There is daily discussion of its incidents, its interests, its problems and its difficulties. There are frequent conferences on educational topics, while several hours every day they are required by their rule to give to individual study. It is easy to see that such a life, even considered apart from the deep and all pervasive religious spirit which inspires it, is favorable, in the highest

[3] The salaries of Sisters teaching in the parochial schools rarely rise above $250 per annum, while in some cases it falls as low as $100. More commonly it is from $150 to $200 per annum. Salaries of Brothers who teach in the schools are generally about twice as much.

degree, to the development of those qualities of mind and heart which go to make the strong, experienced and successful teacher.

On the other hand, the teachers in the public schools, speaking generally, can scarcely be said to be a body of professional teachers at all. It is the exception, rather than the rule, that they are teachers for life. The greater number serve but for short periods. A competent authority has calculated that the average length of the professional career of the public school teacher is only between seven and eight years.[4] In certain States and localities, it is even less than that. It appears to fluctuate with economic conditions, becoming greater in periods of business depression and less in prosperous times. With the greater number, teaching seems to be primarily a matter of bread and butter, rather than of natural taste or aptitude.[5] The situation has been satirized by saying that "the profession of teaching seems to be a kind of waiting room, in which the young girl awaits a congenial, ulterior support, and the young man a more advantageous position."[6] A distinguished German educator has characterized this condition of things as being "next to political influence the most vulnerable point in the whole American school system," adding that "it is evident that the achievements of even a highly gifted people must fall below a high standard under such a régime."[7] The present widespread agitation for the increase of teachers' salaries is a recognition of this defect, and a laudable effort to remedy it, by offering greater inducements to capable young men and women to take up teaching as a profession and make it their life occupation.

A second fundamental advantage of the parochial school, derived from the religious character of the teacher, is the opportunity for a more extended course of professional preparation enjoyed by the members of the religious communities. It is a *sine qua non* condition for entrance into the religious life that the candidate must devote at least one year to serious reflections and preparation. In the case of the teaching orders, this year is devoted chiefly to the work of the normal school. There are religious exercises every day, but the greater part of the time is taken up in the class-room and the study-hall. All parochial school teachers, therefore, may be said to have at least one year of normal school instruction, or its equivalent, before being sent out to teach.

But the year of training in the novitiate does not represent all the Catholic teacher receives in the way of professional training.

[4] President Schurman, of Cornell, Education in the United States, V. I., p. 377.

[5] *Educational Review*, Nov., 1900, p. 415.

[6] Report of the Bureau of Ed., 1892-3, p. 545.

[7] Ibid, p. 566.

The novitiate course is regarded as only the upper grade of the normal school curriculum. Prerequisite for entrance into the novitiate, the orders have, as a rule, a course of training known as the postulate. This period is supposed to last generally for two years, so that the length of the regular course of the Catholic normal school may be set down as three years. As a matter of fact, the great majority of candidates for the teaching orders either omit the postulate altogether or spend but a few weeks in it. In some cases this is done because the candidate has already had the studies of the postulate, but more often it is due to the actual necessity of keeping up the supply of teachers in the schools.

Besides the novitiate and postulate, the summer school must be taken into account as an agency for the training of the Catholic teacher. All the important teaching orders now have summer schools for the benefit of the teachers engaged in the parochial schools. The work usually lasts from four to six weeks, and from two to four hours per day. The courses cover the whole range of the curriculum of the primary and often of the secondary school, and are in the nature of advanced graded studies of the common school topics, from the teacher's standpoint. In addition, there are lectures of a general character on literature, science, art and pedagogy by distinguished educators, both lay and clerical. The teachers of the regular classes are usually the pick of the order, being drawn from the faculties of its leading schools, academies and colleges. The summer school of the religious order has thus a definite and regularly graded curriculum of studies which distinguishes it from the ordinary teachers' institute, and makes it worthy of being classed with such high-grade summer schools as Chatauqua and Martha's Vineyard.

From this outline of the work of the Catholic training school it is evident that the teacher in the parochial schools has, on the average, a great advantage over the public school teacher in the way of professional training. According to the Secretary of the National Educational Association, seventy-five per cent. of the teachers in the public schools have received no professional training whatever.[8] It is not hard to understand the reason why from what has been already said of the non-professional character of public school teachers in general. The renewal of the entire teaching body on the average of once in every seven or eight years makes it impossible for the normal schools to turn out teachers fast enough to supply the demand. The late Professor Hinsdale calculated, on the basis of the returns for 1896-7, that at least forty thousand recruits would

[8] Report of the National Educational Association, 1899, p. 893.

be needed annually to take the place of those who quit the service.[9] But this was more than three times the number of normal graduates that year, and more than one-half the total number of students in all the normal schools and classes in the country. Since trained teachers cannot be got, the best that can be had are hired, and these are generally young women who take up teaching simply as a convenient and easy means of gaining a livelihood for the time being. The non-professional character of the teaching body thus reproduces itself continually. The constant dropping out of teachers makes it necessary to gather in from the highways and the byways in order to fill up the ranks; and the makeshift character of most of the recruits produces in time a crop of new vacancies, which have to be filled in the same way. Not only is there no special preparation for their work in the case of the greater number, but the intellectual equipment of many who are given a license to teach is of the slenderest sort. It has been computed that only about fifteen per cent. of the whole number of teachers in the public schools are normal school graduates, while seventeen per cent. are inexperienced beginners.[10] It is not uncommon to find teachers in the elementary school who have never finished a high school course, and often enough they have never gone farther than the grades of the elementary school.

The course of studies in the normal schools of the religious orders lasts, as has been shown, for three years, at least in theory. In a general way, it may be said that the academic work of this course does not differ substantially from that of the ordinary three years' curriculum of the public normal school. The studies of the first year are subjects ordinarily taught in the elementary school—English, arithmetic, history, geography, drawing and music. During the second year the studies are those of the higher grammar and lower high school grades. Arithmetic is continued, and in addition, composition, rhetoric and literature are taken up, as well as the elementary sciences, especially botany and physiology. Bookkeeping is also frequently introduced in this year. The third year is devoted to high school or academy work—the studies being English literature, modern history, civics, algebra and geometry, the modern and ancient languages. There is, of course, considerable deviation from this curriculum, but, on the whole, it may be regarded as typical. It represents what is actually being done in the normal schools of the larger and more progressive communities. It is the ideal which all the communities are striving to reach,

[9] Ed. in the U. S., V. I., p. 376.
[10] Ibid, p. 377.

and which most of them have succeeded in realizing more or less perfectly.

A remarkable feature of the work of the religious training schools is the comparative neglect of the formal study of pedagogy. The curriculum of both the postulate and novitiate consists almost entirely of the academic branches. Many normal schools have nothing at all in the way of psychology, methodology or educational history, while those that teach pedagogy are content, as a rule, with a brief course of psychology in the last year, and a single course in the theory and practice of teaching, such as that given in Page's "Manual of Teaching," which is in some places used as a text book. There is no observation work, properly so called, and no practice in actual teaching.

This neglect of the study of pedagogy—both as a science and as an art—must be regarded as a serious defect in the curricula of our training schools. It may be admitted that the teaching of the academic branches is fairly well done. The teachers, while without any special pedagogical training themselves, know what they are called upon to teach. They have taught in the best schools of the order. They have had abundant experience, and their experience has crystallized out, to some extent, in sound and definite principles of educational practice. They are, therefore, qualified to direct that "constructive" study of the common school branches which is, as we have seen, the thing of fundamental importance for the teacher. The best proof of the thoroughness which characterizes the work of the religious normal school, so far as the work goes, is the quality of the teaching in the parochial schools. It has been frequently observed that the work of the parochial schools, especially in those studies which are commonly designated as "the Three R's," is, in point of drill and practical effectiveness, superior to that of the public schools.

Yet, as our object must be, not merely to equal the public schools or to surpass them, but simply to make our schools the best possible, to bring them up to the highest degree of efficiency we can, the study of the academic branches cannot be regarded as sufficient for the proper training of our teachers. The studies of the elementary school are merely the tools with which the teacher works. She must be able to handle them with skill and mastery, but this alone will not suffice. There must be some knowledge of the nature of the child-mind, which is the material upon which she works. There must be some scientific knowledge of the educational process. There must be the ability to view this process in the whole, as the adaptation of means to end, and the skill to adapt the means to the character and needs of the individual pupil when circumstances

require. The primary purpose of the teacher, we have come to see, is not to store the mind with information or supply it with a body of principles which may serve as an unfailing well-spring of right moral motives, but simply to supply the conditions needed for the development of the mind's own native powers. The educational process is essentially one of self-development. The determinative impulse to mental development must come from within. Mental growth results from the assimilation of new truth, just as bodily growth comes from the fresh nourishment taken into the system. But in neither case will it do to force the process; the assimilation must come about naturally and spontaneously if it is to result in permanent good. By mere power of drill, the pupil may be made to see that a given proposition is true, and yet the impression produced may be only evanescent. The work of the teacher is to establish a vital connection between the proposition as a bit of demonstrable truth and the mind of the pupil. This can be done only by arousing the pupil's interest, and the study of how to do this, for all kinds of minds, and under all sorts of circumstances, is the study of educational method.

Certain laws of momentum seem to apply to the movements of the mind, as they do to the motions of material bodies. It is a fact of every day observation, for instance, that once the interests and energies of the mind are aroused and stimulated in a given direction, they continue to tend in the same direction. The bent of the mind through life is generally determined, or at least largely influenced, by its impulse at the start. The ideal of life toward which the self-educative growth of the pupil in the school has been shaped usually continues to be the ideal of the man or woman in subsequent years. This is equally true of mental methods and habits acquired during the school years. Hence the importance of forming the mind of a pupil to correct habits of thought from the very beginning. Hence, too, the importance of correcting mistaken methods, whether in the teacher or the pupil, before they become inveterate. The work of the young teacher needs careful and competent supervision, no less than that of the most elementary pupil.

As a matter of fact, experience proves that knowledge of the subjects she is to teach, however thorough it may be, does not prevent the young teacher from making mistakes in method, or afford sufficient security against the danger of such mistakes becoming inveterate. Usually, without ever having had the slightest experience in the way of teaching, the religious, on finishing the novitiate, is sent out to face a class of forty or fifty pupils in a parochial school. There is no time to observe the methods of the older teachers in the school. There is no direct supervision, the

superior or superintendent of the school being busy with her own classes. For a time, therefore, the work of the young teacher is apt to resolve itself into a sort of "struggle for existence." The work has to be done. The school has to go on. Order must be kept, and the pupils kept busy—the busier the better. Until she is sure of herself and of her control of the class, the teacher can do little in the way of arousing that intelligent, self-active interest of the pupils in their work which is as the very life-blood of knowledge. She is forced to fall back upon discipline and authority, and vainly seeks to arouse interest by inspiring fear of punishment or hope of gain. Her teaching, in consequence, becomes formal, mechanical and to a great extent fruitless. The pupils suffer, and the teacher suffers. Thrown practically upon her own resources, without adequate preparation for her work, with no direct supervision, it would be too much to expect the teacher of no more than average ability to pass through such a period of trial and struggle without making mistakes and falling into methods and habits calculated to tell against the efficiency of her teaching later on.

"That the untried teacher should, alone and unaided, begin to experiment with a class of pupils," says one of our most capable and experienced diocesan superintendents, "is unjust to the children and disheartening to herself. Pedagogical ability should have been acquired before she assumes sole charge of a class.

"There is wanting in the novitiates a very important feature of the normal school, properly so called—that is, a 'model' or 'practice' school, wherein candidates for the position of teacher may see the most approved methods in the various grades practically demonstrated by experienced, skillful teachers; and wherein they also, at certain periods, may make their first essays in teaching, under efficient supervision. The helpfulness of such a model school can hardly be overestimated. While observing the work of the experienced teacher, novices would receive inspiration for their future life-work, and in their efforts to teach, under sympathetic, skillful guidance, would acquire like skill and become more confident of their own ability."[11]

The establishment of such model and practice schools in connection with the training schools of the religious orders would involve no great difficulty. Side by side with the novitiate there is usually an academy of the same order for outside pupils, with a primary department, comprising all the elementary grades. It would be easy, therefore, for candidates in the novitiate, while pursuing the study of the academic branches and of pedagogy, to observe

[11] Report of the Superintendent of Schools for the Archdiocese of Philadelphia for the year 1901-2.

the work of skilled teachers in the same grades as they themselves are to teach. Our religious normal schools have a special advantage in the fact that, while the number of pupils in these elementary departments of the academies is generally large, the number of students in the normal school is small, seldom rising above forty, and more commonly varying between one and two dozen. It would thus be feasible to give to each candidate in the normal school an opportunity to teach for a sufficient length of time, and to enable the teaching of each to have the benefit of careful and competent supervision.

But practice teaching cannot be done to advantage during the postulate or the novitiate. There is not time enough for it, and until there has been a thorough grounding in the academic branches, it would be worse than a waste of time. On the other hand, it would be practically impossible to prolong the novitiate. The need of teachers is too great. It is difficult enough, as it is, to meet the demand without curtailing or postponing the novitiate. It would be possible, however, to afford the novices a year of additional training, without any notable diminution thereby of the actual teaching force of the order, if those who are destined for the parochial schools were left to teach for a year or two in the elementary departments of the academies after completing their novitiate. Their work in this way could be done under the supervision of an experienced teacher or of several teachers, who could take charge of the higher and more difficult classes themselves, and who would be responsible for the quality of the instruction throughout. By this arrangement the candidate, by completing the novitiate, instead of going out at once to teach in the parochial schools, would remain for a year at least at the mother house, or at one of the other academies of the order, teaching meanwhile classes practically the same as those of the parochial school. Besides daily revision of the lesson plans for each class, the supervising teacher would pay daily visits to the class rooms, and, at the end of the day, assemble the young teachers in conference, to comment on her observations, discuss practical difficulties, and, in general, give them the benefit of her experience in dealing with the various problems of the school room. Once a week or so there might be a conference upon special pedagogical topics, while, in many cases, the novice would be able also to follow a class or two in the academy or the normal school. This arrangement would involve little, if any, lessening of the order's actual teaching force. It is substantially the plan of practice teaching favored by the best educational thought of the day, and the possible objection that it would involve a lowering of the standard of teaching in the elementary depart-

ments of the academies is disproved by the experience of normal school students teaching in public elementary schools under similar conditions.

But to introduce the formal study of methods into the novitiate, and to add a year of practice teaching afterward, under competent supervision, presupposes teachers for the novitiate and the academy who have had the benefit of a superior training in pedagogy. The training of the teacher of the normal school ought to be as much above that of the parochial school teacher as the work of the latter surpasses that of her pupils. The curriculum of the ordinary normal school ought to be at least of high school grade; and the teacher of the normal school should, therefore, have made a college or university course. Similarly, the teachers of higher collegiate classes in the academies ought to have made post-graduate studies. There exists as yet no adequate provision in any of our Catholic institutions for the training of these two classes of teachers—teachers for the normal schools and teachers for the higher classes of the academies. Some of the stronger academies have, within recent years, established post-graduate courses, but these courses are not designed especially for the training of teachers. Besides, one of the chief obstacles in the way of this post-graduate development—which is so full of promise for the future of our academies—is the lack of any suitable institution to which the religious orders of women might send their subjects for a post-graduate training.

The fundamental and immediate need, therefore, whether we view the situation from the standpoint of the parochial school or of the academy, is for the establishment of a higher normal school for the training of teachers. More than a decade ago Bishop Spalding, in insisting upon the necessity of unceasing efforts toward educational progress, pointed out that, in order to improve the parochial schools, "means must be found to increase the efficiency of our teaching communities of women." To this end he advocated the establishment of a "central normal school, a sort of educational university." The curriculum to comprise the history of education, theories of education, psychology and physiology, in their bearings upon education, methods of education, philosophy and literature, with the classical languages and special sciences; the lecture halls and class rooms to be in a central building, and around this the various teaching communities to establish houses for their younger religious.[12]

There is every reason to believe an institution of this kind would be successful. The need is common to all the communities, and as no one of them could afford to establish such a school for the exclu-

[12] *Catholic World*, April, 1890.

sive benefit of its own teachers, there ought to be a central foundation, common to all, or several such, advantageously situated. The difference of community rules and spirit would not constitute a serious difficulty. This objection would be obviated by the plans suggested above, of a central building for lecture halls, class rooms, etc., with houses of the various communities grouped about it, so that the young religious might follow their regular rule of life, under their own superiors.

Or the plan might be followed which has proved so successful in the great school for the training of religious teachers at Bruges, in Belgium. This institution, which is recognized by the State, was founded in 1859, and is in charge of Les Dames De Saint Audré, whose superior general selects the professors, with the approval of the Minister of Public Instruction. The course of study is for four years. No lay students are received, and students are admitted only on examination. In spiritual matters, the institution is under the direction of a chaplain, who is appointed by the Bishop of the diocese. Simple, practical rules of religious life, approved by the Ordinary, govern the daily life of the students, and are the same for all. The religious in charge have their own community exercises, apart from the pupils; but one of them is always present at the latter to preside. Their own Sisters who follow the normal course live in community with them instead of with the general body of the students. As a further safeguard against any temptation on the part of the students to be drawn away from their own communities, the Sisters of St. Audré have a rule that no religious from another order who has ever been a student at the normal school can be admitted to their community. That these arrangements have worked satisfactorily is shown by the fact that, during the year 1898-9, the school was attended by 125 religious, representing 63 distinct religious communities; while out of the 90 congregations of women which have establishments in the Diocese of Bruges, 85 have sent students to this normal school.

Nearly all our great secular institutions have, within recent years, established higher normal schools, such as suggested, and placed the science and art of teaching on a plane with the learned professions. The object has been to afford a higher professional training to teachers in normal schools and high schools, as well as those who may be ambitious to fit themselves for positions of special responsibility in the way of public school administration or supervision, such as superintendents and principals. At Teachers' College, in New York city, for instance, which may be taken as the typical representative of this new class of normal schools, there is an undergraduate department, modeled upon the ordinary college

curriculum of four years, the first two years being given to the study of the academic branches the candidate expects to teach, and the last two to professional studies, observation work and practice teaching. There is also a graduate department, consisting of advanced courses in the subjects of the college curriculum and leading to university degrees.

It is evident that we are entering upon a new era of normal school development, an era in which the university seems destined to do for the teacher of the normal school what the normal school has done for the teacher in the elementary grades. The Catholic teaching orders occupy a position of peculiar advantage here. The offspring of the original normal school movement inaugurated by La Salle, their very existence and character as teaching bodies are based upon the idea of the professional training of the teacher, and whatever pedagogical advantages the parochial schools possess in comparison with the public schools, are due chiefly to the fact that this fundamental idea of the normal school has reached its fullest development thus far in the religious orders. They ought to be the first, therefore, to take advantage of this new educational movement, representing, as it does, only the continued development of the normal school along the lines of its original foundation. The establishment of Catholic teachers' colleges will stimulate the growth of the teaching orders and develop more fully their vast latent pedagogical resources. It will remedy serious defects in their present training courses. It will insure, as nothing else can, the continued growth and progress of the parochial schools. It will furnish a convincing proof to the non-Catholic mind as to the value of the work that is being done in Catholic schools, and will thus be another step in the direction of that synthesis of parochial school and common school educational systems which is so greatly to be desired.

J. A. Burns, C. S. C.

Washington, D. C.

THE PAPACY AS A NAVAL POWER.

STORIA DELLA MARINA PONTIFICIA. 9 vols. and Atlas of 100 Plates. Rome, 1886-1893. By Padre Alberto Guglielmotti, O. P.

IT MAY seem strange that a government which, like that of the Holy See, has always been regarded as feeble and unwarlike, and which, during the Middle Ages, has often found it difficult to maintain its authority over the City of Rome, should ever have been distinguished as a naval power, and that for many centuries the defense of the coasts of the Mediterranean against piracy

should have been mainly due to its fleets. It is, indeed, a well authenticated fact, though one to which historians have not, as a rule, directed sufficient attention, that the successors of St. Peter have always been the vigilant and unwearied guardians of Christianity against Mahometanism; and it is certain that, if the other sovereigns of Europe had listened to their warning voice and responded to their appeals for help, the Emperors of the East might still be reigning at Constantinople, and some of the fairest provinces of Asia and of Europe would have been preserved from the despotism of the Turk.

The history of these long forgotten campaigns has been written by a learned Dominican, Padre Alberto Guglielmotti, who was born in 1812 at Cività Vecchia, one of the chief seaports of the Papal States, of a family which had often sent representatives to serve on board the warships of the Holy See. He entered the order of St. Dominic at the age of fifteen, and for many years he taught natural philosophy and mathematics in the public schools of the Convent of Sta. Maria sopra Minervam, while at the same time he pursued his antiquarian researches among the archives of the Vatican and of the noble families of Rome. In the voluminous and erudite work which is the result of these labors, Padre Guglielmotti shows a profound knowledge of the technical details of mediæval and modern seamanship, as well as of the sciences of gunnery and fortification, with regard to the development and progress of which he has furnished much new and valuable information. He has also brought to light many hitherto unknown facts in the annals of the Papacy, and he has rescued from the dusty records, where for centuries they had lain in oblivion, the memories of many brilliant and daring deeds and the names of the heroes who performed them.

Long before the Sovereign Pontiffs had acquired sufficient wealth or independence to enable them to form a fleet of their own they had on many occasions sought to persuade the maritime States of Italy to combine for the purpose of repelling the incursions of the Saracens, who were on the point of rendering themselves masters of the countries bordering upon the Mediterranean. By the end of the eighth century not only Egypt and the north of Africa, but also Spain had been conquered by the Mahometans, and in 828 they attacked Sicily. In the following year they took Cività Vecchia, drove out the inhabitants and laid the country waste with fire and sword up to the walls of Rome; they then sailed for the opposite coast of Italy, where they burned Ancona. In the year 846 the Saracens landed at the mouth of the Tiber and made another attempt to seize Rome. The city, which was strongly fortified, was able to resist the efforts of the invaders, but they plundered the

churches and the villas outside the walls. Being at last defeated by the inhabitants of the neighboring mountains, they fled to Gaeta, where they rallied and invested the town until the arrival of troops from the northern provinces of Italy and of the fleets of Naples and Amalfi obliged them to ask for peace and they were allowed to reëmbark, but their ships were overtaken by a violent storm, and nearly all on board perished.

In spite of this loss, another army of Saracens sailed from Africa in 849 for the port of Ostia, at the mouth of the Tiber. Contrary winds drove them to seek shelter for some days off the coast of Sardinia, and this delay enabled the fleets of Naples, Amalfi and Gaeta to come to the assistance of the town, which was held by troops sent by Pope Leo IV. (847-855). In the naval combat which followed the Mahometans were defeated, their vessels which sought to escape were driven on shore by a storm, and the thousands of prisoners who were brought back to Rome were made to work on the walls which Leo IV. built round the Vatican and the Basilica of St. Peter to unite them to the rest of the city and protect them against future aggressions. To this enclosure, which still exists, was given the name of the Leonine City.

The disaster at Ostia did not, however, check the incursions of the Saracens, who continued to devastate Calabria and Apulia, which the Greek Emperors, who were still nominally the rulers of Southern Italy, were unable to defend. Such was the terror caused by their invasions that the cities of Naples, Amalfi, Capua and Gaeta, which were then almost independent of the Government of Byzantium, consented in 876 to purchase an ignominious peace from the infidels, to contract an alliance with them and to assist them in their piratical expeditions. The Duke of Gaeta even allowed the Mahometans to build a fortress at the mouth of the Garigliano, which they held for more than thirty years, and whence they made raids into the provinces of Rome and Benevento and as far north as the Duchy of Spoleto. They then laid waste the valleys of the Tiber and of the Aniene, and occupied strong positions in the mountains near Tivoli, where a village still bears their name. They also plundered the monastery of Monte Cassino, where they massacred the community and seized the monastery of Farfa, whence the monks had fled after having defended it for seven years. It was in vain that Pope John VIII. (872-882) implored the help of Charles the Bald, Emperor of the West, or of Basil, the Macedonian Emperor of the East, or sought to persuade the towns of Southern Italy to renounce their alliance with the Saracens and join their forces with his for the enfranchisement of their country. Being thus obliged to rely on his own resources, he built and armed several *dromones* or large galleys, each

rowed by 100 oars, and at their head, in March, 877, he attacked and defeated a Saracen fleet near Terracina, taking 18 galleys and freeing 600 captives.

This victory could not, unfortunately, be followed up and completed by the total expulsion of the Saracens, as the prolonged struggle between the various pretenders to the Imperial Crown which followed the death of Charles the Bald, and an invasion of the Hungarians, plunged all Northern and Central Italy for many years into a state of warfare and anarchy. It was not until the Pontificate of John X. (914-929) that a league for the expulsion of the Saracens could at last be formed among the many small States into which Italy was divided. At the voice of the Sovereign Pontiff troops flocked from all sides to the standard of the Church; the cities of Southern Italy abandoned their Mahometan allies and joined the league, and the Greek Emperor Constantine sent a powerful fleet to their assistance. In the spring of the year 916 the Pope led the army against the Saracens, who were defeated near Tivoli and driven back to their fortress on the Garigliano. The attack on this stronghold lasted for three months, when the garrison, seeing no prospect of being relieved, tried to cut its way through the besiegers and escape to the mountains, but perished in the attempt. Their destruction put an end to Mahometan invasions for more than a hundred years, and this respite, due to the patriotism and statesmanship of a Sovereign Pontiff, enabled the maritime cities of Italy to develop their institutions, to make commercial treaties with each other and to lay the foundations of their fuure prosperity.

This state of tranquillity was interrupted in 1015 when a Saracen fleet coming from Spain, under a Christian renegade named Mogehid, landed an army of 10,000 men in Sardinia, devastated the island and, crossing over to Tuscany, in the following year took the town of Luni. The Sovereign Pontiff then reigning, Benedict VIII. (1012-1024), immediately called the vassals of the Church to arms, formed an alliance with the Republics of Pisa and Genoa, and drove the pirates not only from Italy, but also from Sardinia, which was placed under the protection of Pisa.

It was also a Pope, Victor III. (1086-1087) who, when Mahometan corsairs were again laying waste the coasts of Italy, sent an expedition against their stronghold. With the help of the Pisans, the Genoese and the Neapolitans he assembled a fleet of 300 vessels and an army of 30,000 men, and although he died before he was able to carry out his project, his death did not suspend the execution of the undertaking, for in the following year under Urban II. (1088-1099), the army, which was led by an ancestor of the house of Colonna, and which bore the standard of St. Peter, landed near Tunis, took

the town of Zavilla and the fortress of Mehedia and rescued several thousand Christian slaves.

It may have been this brilliant victory over the Saracens which induced the various nations of Europe to listen more readily to the supplications of the Holy See in favor of the Eastern Christians, which had hitherto been unsuccessful. In the beginning of the eleventh century, Sylvester II. (999-1003) had addressed an appeal to the Universal Church in the name of Jerusalem,[1] asking for assistance, or at least for alms; but the first definite project of an expedition for the deliverance of the Holy Land is due to Gregory VII. (1073-1085). In 1074 that Pontiff earnestly implored the Emperor Henry IV., the Count of Savoy and the Count of Burgundy to take up arms against the Turks, who were then beginning to penetrate into Asia Minor. In his letter to the Emperor of Germany the Holy Father states that in Italy over 50,000 men were already preparing to assist the Eastern Christians; that he hoped to lead them in person as far as to the Sepulchre of Our Lord, and that during his absence he would entrust Rome and the Church to the care of the Emperor.

The long and bitter struggle with the Imperial power in which Gregory VII. soon found himself, involved as the result of his efforts to free the Church from State control by forbidding ecclesiastics to receive the investiture of their benefices from the sovereign, put an end to these preparations, and it was reserved to Urban II. (1088-1099), the successor of Victor III., to carry out the project which Gregory VII. was the first to suggest. For that purpose, the Sovereign Pontiff convoked a Council at Piacenza in March, 1095, to which the Emperor Alexis Comnenos sent ambassadors to ask for help to enable him to defend Constantinople. His request was favorably received, but it was only at the Council of Clermont, in Auvergne, in the month of November following, that an immense assembly of clergy and laity, roused to the highest pitch of enthusiasm by the eloquence of the Holy Father, answered to his call to arms and resolved to deliver the Holy Land from the infidel.

It does not enter into the purpose of this article to relate the history of the Crusades; it is enough to recall the fact that the first Crusaders took up arms at the voice of a Pope, and that the successors of Urban II. did all in their power to assist the Christian States which were founded in the Holy Land. Thus at the beginning of the Fifth Crusade in 1218, Honorius III. (1216-1227) sent twenty ships to take part in the siege of Damietta, where the Roman troops distinguished themselves by their bravery; and in 1272

[1] Ex persona Hierusalem devastatæ Universali Ecclesiæ. (Gerberti Epistola 28.)

Gregory X. (1271-1276) sent over 2,000 men to the assistance of Ptolemais; but after the death of Saint Louis at Tunis in 1270, it became impossible for the Sovereign Pontiffs to overcome the indifference which the European States manifested towards Eastern affairs. One after another the towns and fortresses of Palestine fell before the Mahometans, while the Kings of Europe, plunged in internecine warfare, remained deaf to all the appeals of the Popes, who alone seem to have been aware of the dangers which threatened all Christendom, and of the necessity of checking the progress of Islam. Ptolemais was the last great Christian stronghold which still kept the infidels at bay, and Nicolas IV. (1288-1292), unable to obtain assistance from any European State, fitted out ten galleys, hired twenty others from the Venetians and sent them with 2,500 soldiers to the relief of the besieged city. After a desperate resistance the town was taken on the 19th of May, 1291, by the Sultan of Egypt, Malek el Aschraf, but the Papal galleys succeeded in saving a large number of the inhabitants and transporting them to the island of Cyprus. Beirut, Tyre and Sidon yielded soon after without making any resistance; their inhabitants were massacred, their buildings leveled with the ground, and with their downfall ended the dominion founded by the Crusaders in the Holy Land which the Popes had done so much to assist and preserve.

At the beginning of the fourteenth century the power of the Turks became still more formidable. They established the seat of their empire at Broussa, in Asia Minor, under the house of Othman in 1317, when they began to devastate the islands of the Ægean Sea, and they attacked Constantinople, which was saved by the bravery of the Genoese and Venetian merchants who were settled there. The Papal Court had at that time been transferred from Rome to Avignon, but even in their exile the Sovereign Pontiffs still watched over the Eastern Christians, and in 1333 Pope John XXII. (1316-1334), after long negotiations, succeeded in forming a league with Philip VI., King of France; the Greek Emperor Andronicus, the Republic of Venice, the Knights of Rhodes and the King of Cyprus, who altogether furnished a fleet of 38 galleys and 32 transports carrying 800 knights. The result of this alliance was a victory in 1334 over the Turks in the Sea of Marmora, where, in spite of their superior numbers, they lost 250 ships and 5,000 men; but at the death of the Pope, which took place in the same year, the league came to an end. The Venetians quarreled with the Genoese; war broke out between France and England; the Emperor Andronicus attacked the Knights of Rhodes, and the Turks, taking advantage of these dissensions, advanced the frontiers of their territories as far as Nicæa.

Ten years later another expedition was prepared in answer to the earnest entreaties of Pope Clement VI. (1342-1354), and in 1344 a fleet of 20 galleys, four of which were furnished by the Pope and the others by Venice, the Knights of Rhodes, the Kingdom of Cyprus and the island of Paros, took the strongly fortified port of Smyrna, which was thenceforth held by the Knights of Rhodes in the name of the Pope and of the Church until it was taken by the Mongols led by Tamerlane in 1402, when they conquered Asia Minor after having defeated Sultan Bajazet at the battle of Angora. This reverse to the Turkish arms and the civil war which ensued between the sons of Bajazet would probably have rendered it possible to reconquer Asia Minor for the Eastern Empire at the beginning of the fifteenth century, if only a permanent peace could have been established between the various States of Europe, which would have allowed them to combine for that purpose. It was not until nearly the close of his reign that Eugene IV. (1431-1447) was able to form an alliance with the Venetians and the Duke of Burgundy, and with their help to send an expedition to seize the Dardanelles and thus cut off the retreat of Sultan Amurath, who had invaded Hungary. This plan was unfortunately frustrated by the treachery of some Genoese merchants who, being heavily bribed, transported 70,000 Turks across the straits, a reënforcement which enabled the Sultan to win the battle of Varna on November 10, 1444, after two days' fighting, when Cardinal Cesarini, the Papal Legate, King Ladislaus and a large number of Polish and Hungarian nobles lost their lives.

The attempt made by Nicolas V. (1447-1455) to save Constantinople when Mahomet II. laid siege to it in April, 1453, was not more successful, for a fleet, to which the Pope contributed 18 galleys and 3,000 men, the King of Naples 20 galleys, the Venetians 25 galleys and the Genoese 7 transports, was still on its way when Constantinople fell on the 29th of May, and it was shortly after scattered by a storm.

The succesor of Nicolas V., Calixtus III. (1455-1458), was even still more ardent in the cause of the defense of Christendom against Islam. When elected Pope he pronounced publicly in the Conclave a vow to make every effort to rescue Constantinople from the Turks, and to procure the necessary funds he sacrificed his private fortune as well as the treasure and the gold and silver plate left by his predecessor; even the clasps and the ornaments of precious metals on the richly bound volumes collected by Nicholas V. were torn off and sent to the Mint. Legates went forth from Rome to persuade the sovereigns of Europe to take part in the Crusade, and monks of various orders to excite the enthusiasm of the people; but the

Pope's efforts were in vain. In France the hundred years' war had just ended and the country was too exhausted and impoverished to undertake a distant expedition; in England the war of the Two Roses had just begun; in Germany the Emperor Frederic III. was engaged in continual struggles with his subjects, and the Venetians had made peace with the Turks, as war would have had an injurious effect on their commerce. Calixtus III. being, therefore, obliged to rely on his own resources, ordered the construction of a dockyard on the banks of the Tiber, sent for the most skillful workmen, and soon creaed a fleet of galleys and transports which he placed under the command of Cardinal Scarampo as his Legate and of a Portuguese officer named Velasco Farinha as vice admiral.

The treachery of Alfonso of Aragon, King of Naples, nearly caused the failure of the enterprise; for the King, who was at war with the Republic of Genoa, persuaded the leaders of another fleet which had been built in the Papal possessions at Avignon, to take part with his galleys in laying waste the territory of his enemies, and he was also suspected of instigating the chief of a band of mercenaries, named Giacopo Piccinino, to make a raid on the Papal States. The adventurer was repulsed and, in revenge, attempted to burn the galleys in the port of Cività Vecchia; but neither the indifference of the European powers nor the hostility of the King of Naples could turn the Sovereign Pontiff from his purpose, and, towards the end of June, 1456, Cardinal Scarampo set sail with 16 galleys and some transports carrying 1,000 sailors, 5,000 soldiers and 300 guns.

Almost simultaneously with the departure of this fleet took place the severe defeat inflicted on Mahomet II. by the Hungarians at the siege of Belgrade, a defeat which saved Europe from a Turkish invasion and which was in a great measure due to the efforts of the Papal Legate, Cardinal John Carvajal, and to the eloquence of St. John Capistrano, one of the missionaries who had been sent to preach the Crusade. They had found it impossible to prevail on the King of Hungary or the greater part of the Hungarian nobles to take up arms; they then turned to the people and raised an army of German and Hungarian peasants, which under the leadership of John Hunyady repelled the assaults of the Turks on the fortress and forced the Sultan's army to fly with the loss of its artillery and baggage.

The Papal fleet, commanded by Cardinal Scarampo, brought arms and provisions to the Knights of Rhodes and then cruised for nearly three years in the Ægean Sea, where it rescued over 100,000 Christian slaves and drove the Turks from several islands which were held by Papal garrisons as long as the expedition lasted. The Pope in the meanwhile built more galleys and sent them with troops

to the assistance of George Scanderbeg, Prince of Albania, which enabled him to win a victory over the Turks. No one, in fact, did more to check the victorious progress of Mahomet II. after the fall of Constantinople than Calixtus III., whose appeals for help met with no response from the sovereigns who owed the safety of their States to his foresight and determination.

It was also with the object of uniting all Christendom against the common enemy that Pius II. (1458-1464), the successor of Calixtus II., assembled at Mantua, after much opposition and long delays, a congress of envoys from all the States of Europe. The first sitting took place in September, 1459, but after wasting some months in useless discussions, the envoys departed without having come to any decision. War broke out soon after between the pretenders to the crown of Naples, and Mahomet II., taking advantage of these dissensions, conquered Bosnia and the island of Mitylene, and attacked the Venetian possessions in the Peloponesus.

Pius II. then resolved, in spite of his age and his infirmities, to place himself at the head of a Crusade, hoping, as he said, that his example might bring together volunteers and arouse the nations whose independence was menaced by the Turks. The Pope left Rome in June, 1464; he had reckoned on obtaining assistance from the Duke of Burgundy, who had made a vow to take part in a Crusade; from the Hungarians, who were alarmed by the conquest of Bosnia; from the Venetians, who saw their Greek territories in danger; and he had endeavored to induce the other Italian States to take up arms, though indeed without obtaining any other result than vague promises to furnish a few galleys. At the last moment, however, the Duke of Burgundy broke his vow by order of his feudal superior, Louis XI., King of France; the plague appeared at Venice and stopped all preparations, and Mathias Corvinus, King of Hungary, was alone determined to fight. On the other hand, large numbers of the peasantry and of the working classes from various countries flocked, as in the time of the Crusades, to take ship at Ancona, but there were no leaders to maintain discipline among these crowds, and, as the Holy Father was borne in his litter towards Ancona, he met numerous bands of recruits returning to their homes, wearied and discouraged. It was only on August 12, after a delay of nearly a month, that Christoforo Moro, the Doge of Venice, arrived with 12 galleys, but Pius II. died on August 15; the Cardinals who had accompanied the Holy Father returned immediately to Rome to hold the Conclave; the Doge, who was allowed to unite to his fleet the six galleys fitted out by the Pope, brought his ships back to Venice and the project of undertaking a Crusade was abandoned.

Paul II. (1464-1471) carried on no campaign against the Turks, though he assisted Matthias Corvinus, King of Hungary, and George Scanderbeg with large sums of money and made ceaseless endeavors to rouse the Italian States from their lethargy, but under his successor, Sixtus IV. (1471-1484), preparations for war were again set on foot. The dockyards of Rome and of Ancona were once more full of activity, and in May, 1472, Cardinal Oliviero Caraffa, as Papal Legate, set sail with 24 galleys and 6 transports carrying 4,700 soldiers. At Rhodes he was joined by 17 Neapolitan galleys and 46 from Venice, together with transports, but this large fleet, which carried over 15,000 soldiers, achieved no more important results than the destruction of the town of Adalia, on the southern coast of Asia Minor, and the plundering of Smyrna. During the following years the action of the Papal galleys was limited to guarding the coasts of Italy against pirates without attempting any more distant expedition, probably for want of allies; for, though the Sovereign Pontiff never ceased to call the attention of all Europe to the dangers with which it was menaced, his warnings met with no response; even the Venetians, in the interests of their commerce, made peace with the Sultan, who, encouraged by this indifference on the part of the Christian world, proceeded to make further conquests. In 1478 the Mahometans seized nearly all Albania; their attack on Rhodes in 1480 failed owing to the bravery of the knights, but, in the same year, they took Otranto, in the south of Italy, massacred a part of the inhabitants and carried the remainder away into captivity. They then held the town for several months, though blockaded by a large fleet and an army collected from all parts of Italy by the efforts of Sixtus IV., and the garrison capitulated only after the death of Mahomet II.

It was only with considerable difficulty and after urgent appeals that Innocent VIII. (1484-1492) and Alexander VI. (1492-1503) succeeded in convoking meetings of ambassadors from the European powers in 1490 and in 1500, with the hope of forming a league against the Turks, who still continued to advance their frontiers; but, after long deliberations, these conferences separated without coming to any practical conclusion, and no supplications or reproaches on the part of the Pope could prevail on the rulers of Christendom to lay aside their petty rivalries and combine for the defense of Europe against their common enemy. Even the Crusade which was preached by Papal Legates throughout Germany, France and England did not meet with much success. The two former countries contributed very little towards the expenses of a war in the East. Henry VII., of England, and the English clergy gave money, but the King refused to send either men or ships; Hun-

gary and Venice alone formed a league with the Pope and Spain was persuaded to assist with some galleys. The only result of the campaign which followed was the conquest of the islands of Cephalonia and Santa Maura, and the latter even was given up when the Venetians made peace with the Sultan in 1503.

But if this indifference or ill will on the part of the rulers of other States rendered it difficult for the Popes to undertake distant expeditions, they neglected no means of guarding the coasts of the Papal territory against the Barbary pirates, who in the sixteenth century were more formidable than ever, as they had become masters of Algiers, Tunis, Tripoli and Alexandria and held the rank of admirals in the Turkish fleet. A small squadron was therefore specially formed for this purpose by Innocent VIII. It consisted of four galleys, two with fifty oars, carrying besides the crew fifty soldiers and 150 rowers, and two thirty oars, carrying thirty soldiers and thirty rowers. For the maintenance of these galleys a duty of two per cent. was levied on all merchandise imported by sea, and from a contract made under Julius II. in 1511 between the Papal Treasury and a Genoese captain who owned these ships, we learn what were the duties of this officer. He was to protect the vessels and the goods of persons going to or from Rome, and to have as perquisites the ships and the property of the pirates whom he could seize; but he was bound to give compensation for the damages caused by pirates within his jurisdiction, unless he could prove that they were so superior in numbers that he could not have attacked them, and he was forbidden to use his galleys for the purpose of trade or to accept any gifts from the merchants to whom he rendered any service.

The limits of this article will not admit of a detailed account of the various engagements in which the Papal Navy played a distinguished part during the sixteenth century; it will suffice to mention the campaign of 1532, during the reign of Clement VII., when a contingent of 12 Papal galleys formed part of the fleet sent by the Emperor Charles V. and the Knights of Malta, under the command of Andrea Doria, a Genoese admiral in the Emperor's service, which took the Turkish fortress of Koron, in the south of the Morea; and the campaign of 1535, under the Pontificate of Paul III. (1534-1548). Twelve Papal galleys took part also in this expedition, led by the Emperor in person, when Tunis, the stronghold of the celebrated pirate Barbarossa, was taken and 10,000 Christian slaves set free.

It may seem hardly credible, but it has been very clearly demonstrated by Padre Guglielmotti that the Sovereign Pontiffs had frequently to struggle not only against the open hostility of the infidels, but also against the duplicity and treachery of their allies, and

especially of the Emperor Charles V. and of his son Philip II. of Spain. Though these monarchs seem to have been perfectly willing to destroy their neighbors, the Algerine pirates who devastated the coasts of Spain, yet whenever their fleets operated in the Eastern Mediterranean, where the Republic of Venice had large possessions, they appear to have instructed their admirals to avoid inflicting a too crushing defeat on the Turkish Empire, but to leave it strength enough to be still dangerous to the Venetians, and thus render the Republic incapable of resisting the ambitious designs of the Spanish monarchy on Italy.

The first manifestation of this policy took place when in 1538 a treaty was made between Paul III., Charles V. and the Venetians, by which these powers agreed to send against the Turks a fleet of 200 galleys, 36 of which should be furnished by the Papal Government and 82 by each of its allies, besides 100 transports provided by the Emperor. The supreme command of the expedition, which carried over 50,000 soldiers, was entrusted to Andrea Doria.

The Venetian contingent and 27 Papal galleys met at Corfu in June, ready to begin the campaign, but Andrea Doria did not appear until September, and then with only half the number of galleys promised. During this delay the Venetians had bombarded the fortress of Prevesa at the entrance to the neighboring Gulf of Arta, but the most favorable months for carrying on a naval campaign had elapsed; and this method of rendering an expedition useless for all practical purposes was adopted on many other occasions by the Spanish Government. More treachery was to follow. After the Venetian attack on Prevesa, Barbarossa had brought his fleet into the Gulf of Arta, and Doria, with the splendid force at his disposal, could have easily forced it to surrender, as the Venitians requested him to do, but he refused and decided to attack the town of Patras, in the Gulf of Lepanto. The allied fleet sailed, therefore, southwards past the mouth of the Gulf of Arta without seeking to bring on an engagement, and on the morning of the following day the Turkish fleet of 94 galleys was seen advancing in pursuit. Doria again wished to avoid fighting, but the Venetians insisted and the galleys formed in line, with the sailing vessels on their flanks. As the two fleets faced each other the wind fell, and though the galleys could have rowed forward and fought, Doria refused to give the signal for the attack, under the pretext that the sailing vessels would have been left behind. Towards evening the wind rose, and still no signal was given, but as the allied fleet drifted down towards the Turks Doria suddenly made his ships spread their sails, led them along with his galleys towards the west and fled to Corfu. The remainder of the allied fleet, left without orders or guidance, reluctantly fol-

lowed the admiral, and Barbarossa, bearing down upon them, soon changed their retreat into a flight. It is a remarkable fact that, in the midst of the outcry of indignation and contempt which arose on all sides against Doria, the Emperor Charles V. should have declared that he approved of his conduct.

As a consequence of this disgraceful defeat a fresh impulse was given to piracy, and Barbarossa, together with Dragut, one of his lieutenants, wrought such devastation on the coasts of Spain and Italy that the Emperor determined to lead an expedition against their chief stronghold, Algiers. Rome contributed seven galleys to the imperial fleet, but the troops had hardly landed on October 24, 1541, when a violent tempest, which destroyed many of the vessels, together with the supplies and the artillery, obliged the Emperor to abandon his project and reëmbark.

Barbarossa died in 1546, and though Andrea Doria expelled Dragut from Mehedia, on the coast of Tunis, the corsair established himself at Tripoli, and the war which broke out in 1555 between France and Spain, as well as that between Spain and Pope Paul IV., in the course of which the troops of Philip II., under the Duke of Alva, invaded the Papal States, enabled him to continue his piratical expeditions. He burned Reggio in Calabria, plundered Salerno and laid the country waste up to the environs of Naples, carrying away thousands of the inhabitants into slavery, and then ravaged the coasts of Spain and the island of Minorca. Pius IV. (1559-1565) could contribute only three galleys to the fleet which Philip II., in March, 1560, sent to attack Tripoli, in the hope of destroying the power of Dragut. The expedition took the island of Jerbah, situated between Tunis and Tripoli, but was then surprised by a Turkish fleet and defeated with great loss. Such was the consternation caused by this disaster that Pius IV. immediately took steps to strengthen the fortifications of Rome and laid the foundations of the line of bastions, which starts from the Castle of St. Angelo, encloses the walls built by St. Leo IV. round the Vatican and St. Peter's, and joins the Tiber at the Hospital of Sto. Spirito. It was also Pius IV. who began to construct the watch towers which guard the coasts of the Papal States, and, as a further measure of defense against the Turks, he organized in 1563 a militia or national guard in which all men capable of bearing arms were enrolled. This citizen army, which amounted to 70,000 infantry and 15,000 cavalry, was divided into companies of 250 men, who assembled in the nearest towns on every feast day for inspection and drill. Certain privileges, such as the right to wear swords and the exemption from some taxes, were enjoyed by those who served in these troops, which were disbanded at the dawn of the French Revolution.

The Papal galleys had perished in the combat at Jerbah, so that when St. Pius V. (1566-1572) wished to assist the Republic of Venice to defend its possessions in the island of Cyprus, which were attacked by Sultan Selim II., he was obliged to purchase twelve empty galleys from the Venetians and equip and arm them at Ancona. Marcantonio Colona, Duke of Paliano, was named captain general of this fleet, and after waiting long at Otranto, he was joined by a Spanish contingent under Gian Andrea Doria, a relation of Andrea Doria. The Venetian vessels were already at Suda Bay, in the island of Crete, and when the Papal and Spanish galleys reached them the departure of the expedition was again so long delayed by the various objections raised by Doria, that while it was on its way it received the news that Nicosia, the capital of Cyprus, had been stormed by the Turks after a desperate resistance; that 40,000 persons had been massacred and 15,000 carried away as slaves. The combined fleets immediately returned to Crete, where they separated, and many galleys perished in a storm while on their way home.

In the meanwhile, the Holy Father, like so many of his predecessors, had sought to persuade the sovereigns of the various States of Europe to form an alliance against the Turks, but only Venice and Spain sent ambassadors to the conference which met in Rome in July, 1570. It soon became evident that the Spanish Government had not a sincere desire to crush the power of the Sultan, for the opposition made by its envoys to every proposal caused the negotiations to last until March, 1571, when a league against the Turks was at last concluded between the Holy See, the King of Spain and the Republic of Venice, by which the allies bound themselves to maintain a fleet of 200 galleys and 100 ships, which were to be in readiness every year at the end of March. The contribution of the Papal Government was fixed at 12 galleys and one-sixth of the expenses. Each power was to name a general, the decision of any two of whom was to be final, and the rank of captain general was assigned to Don Juan of Austria. Before these articles were signed a last attempt was made by the Spanish envoys, to the great indignation of the Holy Father, to defer their execution till the following year, under the pretext that so large a fleet could not be got ready in time, and that that year the allies could only stand on the defensive. This unexpected objection caused the Venetians to despair of saving their possessions which were being devastated by the Turks, while the enormous expense of the fleet was impoverishing the Republic, and they were on the point of coming to terms with the Sultan, had not Marcantonio Colonna, whom the Pope sent to them as ambasador, prevailed on them to adhere to the agreement.

The league was at last solemnly ratified at a Consistory held in

Rome on May 23, 1571, and on June 20 the twelve galleys which the Holy See had hired from the Grand Duke of Tuscany were the first to appear at Messina, where the allies were to assemble. The Venetian fleet arrived three days later, but Don Juan of Austria did not appear with that of Spain, which was mostly composed of contingents from various Italian States, until August 23, and during this delay the Turks had without hindrance laid waste the Venetian territories on the coasts of the Adriatic almost as far as Venice. The Prince was accompanied by a council of five persons named by Philip II., who were to watch over his actions and restrain his impetuosity, and his arrival did not hasten the opening of the campaign, as the Spanish captains showed great repugnance to engage the Ottoman fleet and would have preferred to attack Tunis. Nevertheless, the opinions of Marcantonio Colonna and of Sebastiano Veniero, the admirals of the Roman and of the Venetian fleets, prevailed over these timid counsels, and on September 16 the Prince sailed at last from Messina.

Before relating the naval combat which took place at Lepanto, where the Turkish Empire met with the most serious reverse it had ever experienced at sea, it may, perhaps, be interesting to describe the galleys which at that epoch and even down to nearly the end of the eighteenth century constituted the greater portion of the military navy of the States of Southern Europe. They were long narrow vessels, about 164 feet in length and 22 in width, of very light draught and low free-board, and carried two masts with triangular sails. At the prow was placed a platform called *la rembata*, on which musketeers and armed sailors were posted during an engagement, and from beneath which projected the mouths of five guns throwing balls of 50, 24 and 12 pounds. The poop where the officers stood was raised above the rest of the galley, and a part of it was covered with an awning, which, in the admiral's galley, was of red damask with golden fringes and tassels. A gangway called *la corsia* ran the entire length of the ship; it was the post of the *comito*, who commanded the rowers, and on each side were 25 benches about 10 feet long and a little over 4 feet apart, to which they were chained, to the number, generally, of five to each bench. A cushion made of sacking stuffed with wool, over which was thrown a piece of leather, served to attenuate somewhat the violence of the shock when the slaves fell back on their benches while pulling the oar. At a distance of four feet from the side of the galley ran a beam called *il posticcio*, which was supported by projecting brackets and carried the rowlocks. The ponderous oar was from 30 to 40 feet long, and being too massive to be grasped by the hand, it was worked by means of handles attached to the upper part, which was

also weighted with lead in order to counterbalance the portion extending beyond the galley. Such was the craft which, with slight modifications, was the line of battleship of the Mediterranean States from the Middle Ages down to comparatively recent times and which was only slowly abandoned when the increased size of naval guns rendered it necessary to employ larger and more strongly built vessels.

The fleet advanced slowly round the south of Italy to a port on the coast of Epirus, but during the time which had been wasted by the unreadiness of the Spaniards, Famagousta, the last Venetian stronghold in the island of Cyprus, had fallen. The garrison, consisting chiefly of soldiers from the Papal States in the pay of Venice, had resisted bravely for several months until compelled by hunger to capitulate on favorable terms; but, on the following day, Mustafa, the Turkish general, had caused the principal officers to be put to death, and the Venetian commander, Marcantonio Bragadino, to be flayed alive.

The fleet moved forward again; the Spanish counsellors again sought to dissuade Don Juan from fighting, but the Prince remained firm in his decision, for which he was afterwards severely blamed by the Spanish Court, and as, on the morning of the 7th of October the galleys sailed out of the strait between the islands of Cephalonia and Ithaca towards the Gulf of Lepanto, the Turkish fleet was seen advancing to meet it. The two forces then in presence were the most powerful which had ever met during the long series of wars between Christendom and Islam. On the side of the allies there were 207 galleys, 6 galleasses or large three-masted galleys and 30 transports carrrying 1,815 guns, 28,000 soldiers, chiefly Italian, 12,920 sailors and 43,500 rowers; while the Turks had 222 galleys, and 60 galliots or smaller galleys, carrying 750 guns; the soldiers numbered 34,000, the sailors 13,000 and the rowers 41,000. The Christian fleet formed with its three divisions, in which the galleys of the different States had been indiscriminately mingled, a line of three miles in length. The left wing, comprising 55 galleys, flying yellow flags, was commanded by Agostino Barberino, of Venice. Sixty-one galleys, carrying blue flags, formed the centre, led by the *Reale*, or Royal galley of Spain, and by those of the Spaniards of the different contingents; and the 53 galleys of the right wing, which bore green flags were led by Gian Andrea Doria, who, in order not to be surrounded, placed his division far out to sea and thus left the centre unprotected. A reserve of 30 galleys under the Marquis of Santa Cruz was stationed about a mile to the rear; some smaller galleys served as guards to the admirals, and the six unwieldly Venetian galleasses were towed to a position some distance in front of the line.

The Turkish fleet was also divided into three squadrons. The 95 galleys of the centre were commanded by the Ottoman admiral, Ali Pacha, the brother-in-law of Sultan Selim; the right wing of 53 galleys by Mahomet Schoulak, Viceroy of Egypt; the 65 galleys of the left wing by Uluch Ali Dey, of Algiers, and 10 galleys with 60 smaller vessels formed the rear-guard.

As the Turkish fleet drew near, its admiral fired a gun by way of challenge, to which Don Juan immediately replied; the standard of the league, which had been blessed by St. Pius V., a crimson banner bearing the image of the Crucifix, was hoisted at the mast of the *Reale*, and at the sight all on board the fleet knelt to receive absolution from the priests who were on each galley.

The advance of the Turkish fleet was for a while checked, and its squadrons thrown into disorder by the fire of the heavy guns of the galleasses, but these were soon left behind and the two lines met. On the left the Viceroy of Egypt sought to pass between the Venetians and the land, and succeeded in destroying eight galleys, but was repelled by the bravery of Barberino, who, though mortally wounded, still continued to command. The Venetians then rallied and attacked in their turn. Mahomet Schoulak was killled and his galley sunk; his followers, discouraged by his loss, ran their vessels ashore in attempting to escape, and Barberino survived his wound long enough to learn the defeat of the enemy.

The most desperate fighting took place in the centre of the line, where the galleys of the two commanders came into collision. They were speedily reënforced by others, and the victory remained long undecided until the Turkish admiral's galley was boarded for the third time, when Ali Pacha was killed, the Ottoman standard was lowered, and most of the remaining vessels surrendered. It was on the right of the allied fleets that their chief losses were sustained. Doria had placed his squadron so far from the position assigned to him that Padre Guglielmotti accuses him of a desire to avoid fighting; and when Uluch Ali perceived that several galleys on the right of the central division had become too much detached from it, while trying to fill up the space left vacant by Doria, he fell upon them with such impetuosity that he took twelve, among which was the chief galley of the Knights of Malta. Reënforcements, however, speedily came up, Uluch Ali was obliged to abandon, not only his prizes, but also many of his own vessels, and when he saw that his admiral was defeated, he gave the signal for retreat, and passing through the opening which should have been held by Doria's squadron he fled with forty galleys back to Constantinople. The rest of the Turkish fleet was sunk or taken, about 30,000 of their soldiers and sailors were killed, 3,000 were made prisoners and

12,000 Christian slaves released from their chains. The loss of the allies was about 15,000 killed and wounded. At a council of war held on the following day, it was decided, in spite of the advice of Marcantonio Colonna, not to follow up the victory, but to return to winter quarters, thus ending prematurely a campaign from which, however, may be dated the beginning of the decline of the Turkish Empire.

The campaign of the following year, 1572, afforded a fresh proof of the duplicity of Philip II., for, when Marcantonio Colonna, who had been confirmed in his command by Gregory XIII. (1572-1585), the successor of St. Pius V., joined the Venetian and Spanish fleets at Messina in the month of June, with thirteen Papal galleys, he found that Don Juan had received orders not to leave that port. It was only after long negotiations that Don Juan, whom, on this occasion, the King had provided with a council of twenty persons, was allowed to lend twenty-two galleys to his allies, who left at once, and in the middle of July reached Corfú, where the rest of the Venetian fleet had been in readiness since the beginning of April. Colonna and the Venetians then went in search of the Turkish fleet of 200 vessels, which, by very great efforts, the Sultan had succeeded in assembling, but Uluch Ali, who was in command, not trusting his inexperienced crews, preferred to fly before the allied admirals rather than risk an engagement. While the Papal Venetian galleys were pursuing the Turks, and seeking to force them to fight, they were recalled to Corfú by Don Juan, who had at last arrived at that port, and there took the command of the united fleeets; but it was only on September 11 that, after still further delays, he went in search of the Turks. The Mahometan fleet had taken refuge in the ports of Navarino and Modon, and Colonna and the Venetians hoped to surprise the two squadrons and destroy them before they could effect a junction. But during the night of September 17 the pilot of Don Juan's galley which guided the allied fleet steered it several miles out of its course to the north of Navarino instead of to the south between that port and Modon, thus allowing the Turks to escape from their dangerous position and concentrate their fleet under the protection of the guns of Modon, and losing the opportunity of ending the war by a single blow. It was in vain that Colonna showed that it would still be possible to storm the fortress and seize the fleet; even the Venetians were discouraged and refused to carry out his plans; and after more time had been wasted in useless discussions and a feeble attempt had been made to take a small fort in Navarino Bay, the fleets separated and returned home. The most important result of the campaign was that although it had been the intention of the allies to continue the war, yet the Venetians, considering how

much they had been obstructed and betrayed by the perfidious policy of the King of Spain, preferrred to make peace with the Sultan even on very onerous conditions, and the league of the three Powers was dissolved.

The league was never renewed, but, though the Papal Government was unable when abandoned to its own resources to undertake any distant expedition, it still continued to maintain a small fleet and to guard the coasts of its territory from the corsairs of Algiers and Tunis. This fleet was raised to ten galleys by Sixtus V. (1585-1590), who assigned an annual sum of 102,500 crowns for its maintenance, and named a commission of five Cardinals to watch over its discipline and management.

Clement VIII. (1592-1600) sought to form an alliance with Spain with a view to undertaking a campaign against the Turks, but Philip II. refused; he consented, however, to allow the Papal galleys to join his fleet at Messina, but, as on former occasions, though the Roman contingent appeared at the appointed place of meeting in April, that of Spain under Gian Andrea Doria did not arrive until it was too late to enter upon a campaign, and, in the meanwhile, a powerful Turkish fleet had devastated the coasts of Campania and burned the town of Reggio.

At the beginning of the seventeenth century, under Paul V. (1605-1621), a change took place in the organization of the Papal navy, which thenceforth, with the exception of a few intervals, was maintained by contractors who undertook, in return for a stipulated sum (generally about 80,000 crowns), to maintain in good order three galleys and four small ships. They were also allowed in time of peace to carry merchandise, which had been previously forbidden, and were granted a quarter of the value of the prizes they might take from pirates.

Padre Guglielmotti enters into very full details with regard to the war of Crete, in which the Papal fleet, combined with those of Venice and Malta, played a distinguished part. In this succession of campaigns, which lasted from 1643 to 1669, the Dardanelles were blockaded and a Turkish convoy destroyed in 1657; the Turkish fleets were frequently beaten and driven from the sea; but it was not found possible to raise the siege of Candia, even with the help of an expedition of 8,000 men sent by Louis XIV. After a gallant defense of many years, the town capitulated, and the island of Crete was lost by the Venetians. More success attended the war for the reconquest of the Morea when Poland and Austria joined the alliance in 1684. The Turkish seaports and fortress yielded to the fleets of Rome, Venice and Malta, led by the Venetian admiral, Francesco Morosini, and in 1699 the Sultan, Mustapha II., signed a peace at Carlowitz, by

which he gave up to the Emperor, to Poland and to Venice the territories which they had acquired.

Though the Ottoman Government was at peace with the rest of Europe, the semi-independent Mahometan States of North Africa still continued to send out corsairs, and to guard against them the Papal galleys, usually commanded by Knights of the Order of Malta, sailed every spring from Cività Vecchia to cruise in the Mediterranean till October. Their duties were rendered more arduous by the treaty concluded between France and the Barbary States about 1738, which allowed the corsairs to take refuge in the ports of Provence on condition of not attacking any merchant vessel within thirty miles of the coast; and in 1749 the Grand Duke of Tuscany disarmed his few galleys and gave to the Powers free access to the harbors of his States. About the same time the pirates began to replace their galleys by sailing vessels which could carry heavier guns and remain at sea during the winter, and this innovation rendered necessary a similar change in the Papal navy. Two small frigates of thirty guns were, therefore, purchased in England in 1755 under the reign of Benedict XIV. (1740-1750) for £4,700 each, and named San Pietro and San Paolo, which were replaced in 1762 by two others of thirty-two guns, built in Cività Vecchia, and named San Clemente and San Carlo. Such was, then, the reputation of the Papal navy for efficiency and discipline, that when in 1764 Carlo Emmanuele III., King of Sardinia, wished to equip vessels for the protection of his territories, he applied to Rome for information with regard to the organization and regulations of the Papal fleet.

In the lattter part of the eighteenth century the Barbary corsairs still continued to make their piratical expeditions, but more rarely and no longer on the same formidable scale as in the past, and further changes were therefore made in the composition of the Papal navy. In 1793 the three galleys were still maintained and they were manned by 218 officers and sailors and 183 soldiers, but the frigates had been replaced by two corvettes of twenty guns with crews of 145 men each. There were also four launches, each carrying a twenty-four-pounder and twelve smaller pieces; eight gunboats with a twelve-pounder each and six smaller guns, and a mortar vessel. The crews of these thirteeen boats amounted to 256 men. Another modification took place in 1796, when the three galleys were set aside and replaced by two *mezze galere* or half galleys rowed by forty sailors instead of by convicts, carrying one twenty-four-pounder, two twelve-pounders and eight smaller guns, and manned by two hundred sailors and fifty soldiers.

Such was the Papal navy when the troops of the French Republic after conquering Lombardy invaded the States of the Church with-

out declaration of war. By the treaty of Tolentino (19th February, 1797) the Holy See was deprived of Avignon, of the Legations of Bologna, Ferrara and Romagna; and on February 10, 1798, under pretext of avenging the death of General Duphot, who was shot during a popular tumult in Rome, General Berthier occupied the Eternal City.

A few days later the Republic was proclaimed, and by order of the French Directory, Pius VI. was carried away a prisoner into Tuscany, leaving all the possessions of the Church in the hands of the French.

The invasion of Egypt took place shortly afterwards, and when Bonaparte left Toulon in the month of May with the main body of the expedition, all the merchant vessels in the port of Cività Vecchia were seized for the purpose of transporting General Desaix and five regiments of the army of Italy to Alexandria. The Papal *mezze galere*, the eight gunboats and two of the launches, along with their crews were forced to serve as escort, and the French also took with them the Arabic types belonging to the College of the Propaganda.

After the taking of Alexandria by the French, the twelve Roman boats acted as guard to the flotilla of seventy-two small vessels laden with stores and ammunition which ascended the Nile to Cairo, and, together with the troops which had marched across the desert, they inflicted a severe defeat on the Mameluke Beys at the village of Shebrahet. A few days later they again took an important share in the attack on Embabeh, a combat which is better known as the battle of the Pyramids, where they destroyed a much more numerous Turkish flotilla of corvettes and gunboats. The *mezze galere* and some other boats of the Papal navy formed also part of the expedition led by General Desaix into Upper Egypt as far as the first cataract, defeated the Mamelukes in two engagements and took what remained of their vessels. The *mezze galere* then descended the Nile to be placed as guard ships at Damietta and Ghizeh, and they probably fell into the hands of the English by the capitulations of Cairo and Alexandria. The rest of the flotilla was surprised on the Upper Nile by the Mamelukes; its chief officer blew up his boat rather than surrender, and nothing is known of the fate of the others, but none of the vessels were taken away from Cività Vecchia and only very few of the sailors ever returned.

The Papal navy was never reëstablished on the same footing as in the days when in alliance with Spain and Venice it fought against the Mahometan fleets. In 1804 Bonaparte, when First Consul, gave Pius VII. two brigantines of sixteen guns, which took some corsairs; but the conquest of Algiers by France in 1830 put an end forever to the piracy which for so many centuries had devastated

the shores of the Mediterranean and rendered necessary the existence of a protecting force.

During the reign of Pius IX, the Papal Government still maintained as coast guards in the Mediterranean and the Adriatic four small gunboats and a corvette named *l'Immacolata Concezione*, which had been built in London in 1859. When Rome fell at last into the power of the Italian Government in 1870, Pius IX. presented the corvette to the French fathers of the order of St. Dominic, who employed it as a training ship at the Naval School of St. Elmo, which they had founded at Arcachon, in the department of La Gironde, under the direction of a member of the order who had been a naval officer. At his death, some ten or fifteen years ago, the corvette was sold, and the school was closed this year. Thus has disappeared the last representative of a navy which carried the standard of the Church for a thousand years, and which, in spite of the indifference, the hostility and even the treachery of the other European Powers, ever performed its duty undauntedly in the long and, as yet, unended struggle between Christendom and Islam.

DONAT SAMPSON.

London, England.

HEGEL AND THE SCHOOLMEN.

THERE are probably many readers of the present day who pay but little heed to the contending claims of rival schools of philosophy. To some the contest may well seem to be an empty war of words, without life or reality or prospect of definite issue. And they turn their attention to historical studies, or Biblical Criticism, or scientific research; or to the practical problems of politics and sociology. It may be allowed that, for the present at least, these matters are really of deeper moment than any abstract questions of metaphysics. Yet it is surely a grave mistake to treat the claims of philosophy too lightly, or to regard the interest which it formerly excited as an idle waste of intellectual energy. For, after all, these neglected problems of metaphysics lie at the roots of all the others. And the ideas of philosophers have more to do with scientific and social progress than superficial observers are apt to imagine. The apparently idle disputes of Nominalists and Realists, in the twelfth century, issued in a deep broad stream of thought that fertilized the whole field of mediæval life, and produced abundant fruit in its religion, its art and literature, and its social

system. The new ideas of the philosophers of the Renaissance wrought a far-reaching change in the whole fabric of Western Europe. The dreams of Rousseau were working in the great French Revolution. And in later days, the home of modern philosophy, the land of Kant and Fichte, of Schelling and Hegel, became the predominant power in politics, the temple of art and literature and the chief centre of historical science and Biblical Criticism.

For this reason it would be well if Catholics who rightly take a keen interest in the Biblical Question and the Social Question were equally alive to the importance of the issue involved in the question of philosophy. By this we do not mean any of the nice details of domestic controversy among our scholastics, or the old-time rivalry of Nominalists and Realists, Thomists and Scotists. These things still have their interest. But the crucial question is something broader and deeper. It is concerned with the whole state of Catholic philosophy and its relations with the wider world of modern thought. In a word, is Scholasticism adequate for the intellectual needs of the hour? Must it be, sooner or later, superseded by some modern system? Or is there not, to say the least, some room for improvement, for new methods and broader views and a more intelligent appreciation of modern philosophers?

This question was raised in the course of a recent controversy in England, and answered from their very different standpoints, but in a like uncompromising fashion, by liberal Catholic writers and by professors of scholastic philosophy. Thus, on the one side, we find that brilliant and incisive critic, Mr. Robert E. Dell, putting aside the scholastic method as hopelessly outworn and obsolete. To quote his own words on this topic, "The weapons with which the heroes of old won their philosophical victories are indeed ornaments to the Church, but their proper place nowadays is in a museum; to put them in an armoury for use is about as sensible as it would be to arm a modern soldier with a suit of chain armour and a cross-bow."[1]

As an example of the opposite extreme, we may take the words in which a distinguished scholastic professor repudiates the suggestion that the philosophy of our schools ought to assimilate the teaching of modern thinkers.

"It would probably be as hard to transmute into true philosophy the errors that have flourished from the time of Locke to that of Schopenhauer as for a wren to digest a church steeple. Had St. Thomas, we are told, been living to-day, he would in this nineteenth century have yoked Hegel to his car, just as in the thirteenth he

[1] *Nineteenth Century*, April, 1900, p. 675.

yoked Aristotle. But I have never met with any proof of that assumption or with any suggestion as to how the said yoking is to be performed. You cannot couple together light and darkness, truth and error. Between Aristotle and Hegel there is a wide difference. The former was radically right; the latter is hopelessly wrong."[2]

There is certainly a sharp contrast between the views of these two able writers. Yet they have, withal, some common characteristics. Both alike show the same confidence in their own cause, and the same contempt for the other philosophy. And in this they may be taken as typical of the attitude adopted by many other champions of advanced views and professors of orthodox Scholasticism. Mr. Dell, we fancy, is by no means alone in wishing to banish scholastic philosophy to the seclusion of a museum; while other reformers would possibly be more contemptuous, and cast aside the old weapons as mere worthless lumber. And on the other hand, Father Coupe is by no means taking up a new position when he dismisses Hegel as "hopelessly wrong," and scouts the suggestion that we ought to assimilate the teaching of modern philosophers. The same view of the matter, if not in the same forcible and picturesque language, may be seen in any of our philosophic text-books, where the systems of Kant and Fichte, and Schelling and Hegel are briefly set forth and formally refuted as false and absurd. The refutation probably appears effective enough to the ingenuous schoolboys for whose edification the books are intended—at any rate, it had this appearance to a certain simple student a quarter of a century ago. But this summary treatment of the German masters may well produce a very different impression on those who are familiar with their writings, or on converts who have studied philosophy at the feet of English Hegelians. In the latter case, the most likely result is a feeling of contempt for the methods of modern Scholasticism. And we fancy that this may be the origin of some recent exhibitions of hostility. But on this point the present writer cannot speak from his own experience; according to the straitest of their sects he was bred a scholastic.

It is not the purpose of the present paper to pursue the well-worn controversy on the rival merits of the old and new philosophies. There are many grave reasons that might be urged on either side of the question. Much that has been said by recent writers offers a tempting subject of criticism. And it would be an easy task to carry on the fray in the old familiar fashion, to make a fresh flourish

[2] See an article on Catholic Philosophy by Father Charles Coupe, S. J., in the *Tablet*, November 24, 1900. The writer is summarizing some of his own remarks in a lecture delivered to the students at Oscott.

of the commonplace arguments in favor of life and progress or orthodox conservatism; to cast ridicule on the continued use of musty mediæval methods, or to inveigh against the rash introduction of dangerous innovations. But there is no lack of advocates on either side, and it would be somewhat superfluous to add to their number and say over again what has been so ably said by others. There may, however, be some advantage in attempting to regard the whole matter in a different aspect, which has hitherto received but little attention. Much has been heard from the stalwart champions of Scholasticism who would reject all the modern systems, root and branch. And on the other hand, the zealous advocates of the new philosophies have been loud in their scorn of the schoolmen. In the heat of the fray it is likely enough that neither side has done full justice to the views of its opponents. And it is high time that the question was surveyed from the more impartial standpoint of students who can find much to admire both in the mediæval schoolmen and in the great thinkers of modern Germany.

To some it may seem idle to intervene in the discussion with this pacific purpose. We may be told once more that we cannot reconcile truth with error, or light with darkness, or make a Mezentian union of the dead and the living. But we have no wish to deny or to explain away the real and deep differences which divide the old and the new philosophies. We would not seek to make scholastics of Kant and Hegel; or to recast St. Thomas in a German mould; or to blend their teaching in some new and marvelous system,

> "ein Zwitter, ein Mittelding,
> Das weder Fleisch noch Fisch ist,
> Das von den Extremen unserer Zeit
> Ein närrisches Gemisch ist."

Happily we are engaged on a more modest, and at the same time, a more hopeful enterprise. We would fain endeavor to see both the mediæval and the modern philosophies as they really are in themselves, not as they appear when seen through the distorting medium of unsympathetic or hostile criticism. From this standpoint we may be able to make some profitable comparison, to note any points of resemblance or analogy, and maybe to find that, even where they differ, each may in some measure be illustrated by the other. Much of what has been said so far will obviously apply to the comparison of any modern philosophy with the scholastic system. But in the present study we may confine our attention to Hegel, partly indeed from personal preference for that philosopher, but chiefly because his ideas have a far-reaching influence in modern English thought, while on the other hand he has probably suffered more than any of his compeers at the rude hands of controversial opponents.

We are not now concerned with the bold suggestion that the scholastic system should be abandoned and some new philosophy set in its place; nor need we dwell on the uncompromising answer of the orthodox champions. But we may venture to remark that the alternative is sometimes presented in a manner that is a little misleading. After all, it is not a simple question of yea and nay; or a choice between two abstract propositions, of which it can be said that the one is false and the other true. To listen to some controversialists, we might suppose that the scholastic philosophy was something simple, uniform and indivisible, which is to be received in its entirety or rejected altogether. Yet, when once we turn from the trivial text-books of to-day to the large and varied literature left by the mediæval masters, we can readily see that neither course is possible. In that wide mass of doctrines, principles, profound speculation, subtle distinctions and fleeting, often conflicting, opinions, that makes up the philosophy of the schoolmen, there is much that their most loyal and conservative disciple must fain relinquish; and much that must needs be accepted by the most progressive of modern thinkers.

In spite of all the safeguards provided by its vaunted logical methods, it must be confessed that mediæval philosophy was often disturbed by the presence of dangerous doctrines, and opinions as strange and fantastic as any of the dreams of later ages. And, in spite of all that is said in its disparagement, it has left a goodly legacy to modern philosophers. But, unfortunately, too many modern readers know nothing of the debt which their new masters owe to the despised mediæval schoolmen. For many seem to suppose that the philosophy of these last centuries began afresh with Descartes, or Locke, or Bacon. Most modern students are aware that Kant is under some obligations to Hume and Berkeley. But how many of them know that Hume owed something to the teaching of St. Thomas? Coleridge tells us that his friends were incredulous when he first suggested that the Scottish skeptic had borrowed anything from the Angelic Doctor. But the justice of his surmise was fortunately confirmed by satisfactory evidence.

As the *Biographia Literaria*, though known to lovers of literature, may not be equally familiar to students of philosophy, it may be well to cite the poet's words on this matter.

"In consulting the excellent commentary of St. Thomas Aquinas on the Parva Naturalia of Aristotle, I was struck at once with its close resemblance to Hume's essay on association. The main thoughts were the same in both, the *order* of the thoughts was the same, and even the illustrations differed only by Hume's occasional substitution of more modern examples. I mentioned the circum-

stance to several of my literary acquaintances, who admitted the closeness of the resemblance, and that it seemed too great to be explained by mere coincidence; but they thought it improbable that Hume should have held the pages of the Angelic Doctor worth turning over. But some time after Mr. Payne, of the King's mews, shewed Sir James Mackintosh some odd volumes of St. Thomas Aquinas, partly perhaps from having heard that Sir James (then Mr.) Mackintosh had in his lectures past a high encomium on this canonized philosopher; but chiefly from the fact that the volumes had belonged to Mr. Hume, and had here and there marginal marks and notes of reference in his own hand writing. Among these volumes was that which contains the *Parva Naturalia*, in the old latin version, swathed and swaddled in the commentary afore mentioned!"[3]

It is clear that the scholastic philosophy cannot be accepted in its entirety or rejected as worthless. Nor is it otherwise with the philosophy of Hegel. Of course if it were only a question of the abstract and mysterious system set forth and refuted in our text-books, the rejection *in toto* might be a comparatively simple matter, at least so far as the reader can attach any intelligible meaning to these cryptic utterances. But it is a very different thing when we turn to consider the voluminous writings of that vigorous and original thinker, who like the great schoolmen of old had fairly grappled with the multitudinous problems of the whole world of thought and being. It may well be doubted whether his most loyal and devoted disciple would be likely to accept the whole of Hegel's teaching without reserve or misgiving. And on the other hand, we make bold to say that no candid and unprejudiced student of the German philosopher would reject the whole as false or worthless.

In this way, it will be seen at once that a wider acquaintance with the literature of mediæval and modern philosophy does something to lessen the difference by which they are divided. Were it only for this reason, it is much to be wished that a knowledge of this kind could be made an indispensable condition in all those who would discuss the merits of the rival philosophies. It certainly does not seem too much to ask that critics should have an accurate and intimate acquaintance with the writers or systems on which they venture to pass judgment. Yet we fear that this reasonable requirement is not always fulfilled. Father Coupe tells us that he has never met a scholar holding advanced views on the subject of Scholasticism who was at the same time qualified by training to give a trustworthy opinion. And, on the other hand, the language held by

[3] Coleridge's "Biographia Literaria," chapter v., pp. 104-5.

some Catholic critics of Kant or Hegel suggests a shrewd suspicion that the writer's acquaintance with the German philosophers is neither wide nor accurate. Yet here, if anywhere, there is need of an intimate knowledge of the original authorities. It is, we hope, no disparagement to the many excellent modern manuals of scholastic philosophy to say that however useful as an introduction to the subject, they are but a poor substitute for reading the mediæval masters in their native folios. And though Mr. Lang tells us that Hegel "mostly at second-hand" is a paying commodity in Oxford examinations, something more than this is needed to enable us to pass judgment on the German philosopher.

> Wer den Dichter will verstehen,
> Muss in Dichter's Lande gehen."

We may remark in passing that this same superficial and second-hand knowledge is, if we are not much mistaken, one of the foremost dangers of the present day. With the great increase of periodical literature, and the multiplication of popular primers and books of reference, it is open to every sciolist to lay down the law on matters of which he has little real knowledge, and pass judgment on authors whose writings he has never read. It is indeed possible to read without understanding, and prejudice may sometimes produce the same effects as ignorance. But if we could once get well rid of the superficial writers who speak without direct knowledge of the original authorities, the world would be delivered from a flood of captious controversy and unintelligent criticism.

Apart from this consideration, there is a further advantage in betaking ourselves to the pages of the great masters themselves. For, as Warburton has well said, they are frequently free from the party violence that is conspicuous in many of their followers. And certainly it is a relief to turn from the sharp censures of some of Hegel's admirers to see how Hegel himself has treated the despised mediæval schoolmen.

In some respects the most striking feature in his writings is the manner in which he has grasped and set forth the real unity of all history and all philosophy. In his view of the matter no philosophy is simply false or worthless. All the varied and interminable systems are but so many links in one long living chain, or stages in the gradual growth and evolution of human thought and history. To some it may seem that this is his own chief contribution to philosophic thought, and by this, rather than by his distinctive system, his name is likely to live in the literature of philosophy. The word evolution has become somewhat hackneyed of late. Yet few we fancy will dispute the profound importance of this idea, which has, we may say, dominated the world of science in Darwin's "Origin of

Species," and the world of theology in Newman's "Development of Doctrine." The significant resemblance of these two epoch-making books has often been remarked. And Mr. Spencer Jones has lately pointed out some curious coincidences in the gradual growth of the same leading idea in the minds of the man of science and the theologian. But without in any way disputing the originality of the work done by the two great English writers, we may observe that the German philosopher was in the field before them. Needless to say, there are some important differences in the mode of the idea and its method of treatment, as there are differences between the conception of Newman and that of Darwin. But the same great principle of development or evolution is plainly seen in Hegel's chief writings, notably in the "Philosophie der Geschichte" and the "Geschichte der Philosophie." In some respects the last named work has been surpassed by more recent histories of philosophy. But it was surely no mean service to this study to present the apparently aimless succession of conflicting systems as the working out of an ordered process.

This principle which recognizes the importance of all the philosophers of the past—whose thoughts as Hegel finely says are still as living and present as at the day of their birth—cannot but apply to the mediæval schoolmen. And accordingly we find that he pays some attention to their writings when he comes to treat of this period of philosophic history. The respect with which he speaks of St. Thomas and Scotus and the other mediæval masters is a pleasing contrast to the contempt displayed by some of their modern critics. Thus he sees that the *Summa*, with its formal logic, is yet free from idle subtleties, and is full of deep speculative thoughts on the whole field of theology and philosophy.[4] He frankly recognizes that the scholastic Latin of Scotus, in spite of its barbarism, is admirably adapted for the purposes of philosophy.[5] And looking at its deep speculative character, he sets the mediæval theology higher than that of modern days. The Catholics, he says bluntly, were never such barbarians as to think that eternal truth could not be known and grasped philosophically.[6]

---

[4] "Es finden sich in diesem Buch zwar logische Förmlichkeiten, aber nicht dialektische Spitzfindigkeiten, sondern gründliche metaphysische (speculative) Geoanken, über den ganzen Umfang der Theologie und Philosophie." Hegel's Werke, Vol. XV., pp. 173-4.

[5] "Das Latein ist sehr barbarisch, aber zur philosophischen Bestimmtheit gut geeignet." Ibid, p. 176.

[6] "Die Theologie des Mittelalters steht so viel höher, als die der Neueren Zeit. Nie sind Katholiken solche Barbaren gewesen, dass über die ewige Wahrheit nicht erkannt, sie nicht philosophisch gefasst werden sollte." Ibid, p. 169. Cf. Vol. XIII., p. 97. "Die Scholastiker waren nicht solche Supranaturalisten: sie haben denkend, begreifend das Dogma der Kirche erkannt."

At the same time, it must be confessed that Hegel's account of the schoolmen and their writings can scarcely satisfy those who have made more extensive studies in this branch of philosophical literature. For, with all his keen insight and speculative powers, the German thinker was wanting in some of the qualifications needed by the literary historian. And his "Geschichte der Philosophie," whatever may be its merits in other respects, is marred by a strange inequality and lack of proportion. In some parts the author, carried away by some sympathy with his subject, is too copious and discursive, *e. g.*, when he is dealing with that singular philosopher, Jakob Böhme. Elsewhere, on the other hand, his notices are meagre and disappointing, while his information does not appear to be directly drawn from the original sources. And such is too commonly the case when he is dealing with the scholastic writers. It need hardly be added that his imperfect acquaintance with their works affects his general estimate of the philosophy of this important period.

Here, however, we must make an exception in the case of St. Anselm, whose writings seem to have made a profound and lasting impression on the mind of Hegel. For the great Archbishop's "Ontological Proof of the Existence of God" holds a curiously conspicuous place in the works of the German philosopher. It may be considered as an instance of intellectual kinship making itself felt in spite of the barriers opposed by the difference of time, and race, and religion. The famous argument of St. Anselm was disputed at once by the mediæval monk, Gaunilo. And in spite of the Archbishop's answer, it was rejected as invalid by St. Thomas and the main body of the schoolmen. Revived in a later age by Descartes and his followers, in a somewhat modified form, it was roughly handled in a well-known chapter of Kant's "Kritik der Reinen Vernunft." Yet, after all this long neglect and reiterated refutation, we find it taken up afresh by Hegel and explained and defended in many notable passages of his philosophical writings. It seems, we may say, to have a fascination for him, and he seizes every available opportunity of recurring to the subject.

Without pretending to give a complete list, we may mention the following instances: In the "History of Philosophy" the argument is naturally treated in the notices of St. Anselm as well as in those of Descartes and Kant.[7] In the "Logic of the Encyklopädie" it is defended from Kant's criticisms; it is shown in its original form as it appears in St. Anselm, and after pointing out that Descartes and Spinoza had given it a more objective character, Hegel seeks

[7] Hegel's Werke, Vol. XV., pp. 164, 349, 583.

to make it perfect in his own peculiar fashion.[8] In the larger "Logic," again, the argument is discussed in various aspects in several parts of the work.[9] In some of these instances the matter is merely touched on incidentally, though enough is said to show Hegel's sense of its importance. But in the second volume of the "Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion," and again in the appended special lectures on "The Proofs of the Existence of God," the Ontological Argument of St. Anselm is treated more fully and extensively.[10] It is interesting to note that Hegel's last pages on the subject were written in 1831, shortly before he was cut off by the cholera. And it is here that his preference for this proof is expressed in the most decided manner. For he observes that it is generally used by later philosophers, "yet always along with the other proofs, although it alone is the true one."[11]

Admirers of modern philosophy who affect to treat the schoolmen with contempt would do well to follow the example of Hegel in this matter. And in the same way we may say that some of our censorious critics of the German thinkers might well be reminded of the lesson left by the great mediæval masters. It is true that, in this case, we cannot have the same direct evidence. We have seen how Hegel treated St. Thomas and the other schoolmen. But where can we see how the Angelic Doctor would have treated Hegel? It would seem that this must be largely a matter of mere conjecture, on which each one of us may be left to form his own opinion. Yet, after all, there is some evidence that will at least carry us a certain way. For we can see how St. Thomas dealt with the heterodox works of philosophy current in his own day, and we may happily find that he showed a broader and more tolerant spirit than some of his modern disciples.

It is sometimes assumed, or asserted, that the mediæval schoolmen accepted the sound philosophy of Aristotle as authoritative, and roundly rejected the false teaching of the other systems. We all know the conventional formula that is used to explain the changed attitude of the Church authorities in regard to the works of Aristotle. It was an Aristotle corrupted by Arabic translators that was condemned, while the real Greek philosopher was made the oracle of orthodoxy. But though the character of the commentaries was one of the causes of this initial condemnation of the texts, the facts, we fancy, were not quite so simple as the theory. Translations from the Greek were among the first to fall under

[8] Werke, Vol. VI., pp. 112, 362 ff.

[9] "Wissenschaft der Logik," I., pp. 27, 56; II., pp. 81, 138; III., p. 192, original Nürnberg edition, 1812-16.

[10] Hegel's Werke, Vol. XII., pp. 210 ff, 246 ff.

[11] "Obgleich er allein der wahrnafte ist," l. c. p. 547.

censure; and much was ultimately accepted from the Arabs. Here, again, the issue has been confused by the want of direct acquaintance with the original sources. How many of those who glibly echo the common charge of corruption, have ever read a line of Aristotle in Arabic? Those who have some experience of the way in which some of these translators accomplished their peculiarly difficult task would surely speak with more moderation on this matter. And, indeed, without any tinge of Oriental learning, we might be saved from this mistake by a closer acquaintance with the writings of St. Thomas, who made use of much that came from the hands of these despised Arabic interpreters, though he justly preferred versions made directly from the Greek original.

In this matter the most instructive instance is his treatment of the celebrated book "De Causis." This, as the reader may be reminded, was translated from an Arabic adaptation of a treatise of Proculus, the Neo-Platonist, and was falsely ascribed to Aristotle himself. Here, it might be said, was a typical case of Arab corruption. And it is scarcely surprising to find that it incurred condemnation and was branded, probably with some justice, as a source of heresy and other errors. On this point it will be enough to cite the words of Archbishop Vaughan:

"William of Auvergne was bound to censure a string of propositions, which were taken from the worst Arabic commentators on Aristotle, or from that deadly book, 'De Causis,' which had so baneful an influence in the middle ages."[12]

But how did St. Thomas himself treat this "deadly book?" He made it the subject of a systematic and discriminating commentary, which is one of the most valuable of his purely philosophical writings. And while he justly rejects the view that it belongs to Aristotle, and recognizes its true source in the work of "Proculus the Platonist," he does not shrink from adopting some of its principles and incorporating them in his own large-minded system of philosophy. This is especially the case with that pregnant principle of Proculus, which may be said to give the key to the scholastic theory of knowledge, "omne quod recipitur in aliquo, est in eo per modum recipientis."[13]

St. Thomas, we may add, makes good use of this principle elsewhere in his works, notably in the "Summa Theologiae" and in the "Summa contra Gentes," and he takes care to cite the authority of

---

[12] "Life and Labors of St. Thomas of Aquin," Vol. I., p. 405.

[13] See St. Thomas, "Quaest. Disp. De Potentia," qu. 3, art. 3, obj. 1; "Lib. De Causis," lectio x. "Et similiter aliqua ex rebus non recipit quod est supra eam nisi per modum secundum quem potest recipere ipsum, non per modum secundum quem est res recepta."

the "Book on Causes."[14] And it is clearly, as Canon Kaufmann justly considers it, one of the fundamental principles of the scholastic philosophy. These facts are well worthy of note, for they furnish a much needed corrective to the popular conception that Scholasticism was nothing but a servile following of Aristotle. And what is more to our present purpose, the good use which St. Thomas made of the truth contained in the pages of the Platonist theologian and his Arab interpreter should show his modern disciples how to deal with the philosophy of Kant or Hegel.

What has been said so far may happily help to recommend a dispassionate comparison of the philosophy of Hegel with that of the schoolmen, in place of that narrow spirit which would set up the one as an oracle and treat the other with contemptuous hostility. Little good can be hoped from a barren and bitter controversy, from Liberal sneers at the schoolmen or scholastic gibes at the great German philosophers. But without leading to any reversal of the main position, or to the abandonment of anything that has been made good in the past, a candid comparison may at least serve to set both systems in a truer light, and give us a clearer view of their respective merits or shortcomings. It is, in any case, a large subject, and one of some delicacy and difficulty. And the suggestions here offered can be taken as little more than a tentative proposal. The actual accomplishment of the comparison could not be attempted in these pages with anything like completeness. Still, before we leave the subject, we may venture to touch on some of the distinctive characteristics of the modern and the mediæval masters, and note some curious points of resemblance or analogy in the philosophical methods of Hegel and the schoolmen.

Let us say once more that, while we find much to admire both in the old and in the new philosophers, we should be the last to doubt or deny the broad and deep differences by which they are divided. Nor is the difference confined to the matter of their teaching. In outward fashion, in methods, in style and language they often present a curious contrast. It is a far cry from the luminous perspicuity of St. Thomas, the rare combination of deep thoughts and clear language, to that proverbial obscurity which Hegel seems to hold as a heritage from his master Heraclitus:

> Clarus ob obscuram linguam magis inter inanes
> Quamde gravis inter Graios qui vera requirunt.

The obscurity of the German philosophy, like that which is commonly ascribed to a great English poet, has often been made the subject of jest. It has even brought his name into the inimitable

[14] Cf. S. Th. I., ii., qu. 5, art. 5; II. ii., qu. 23, a. 6, ad. 1. Contra Gentes, ii., 98, etc.

Breitman Ballads, where it is coupled in humorous condemnation with that of Jean Paul Richter:

"Ash der Hegel say of his system—dat only von mans knew,
Vot der tyfel id meant—und *he* couldn't tell—und der Jean Paul Richter, too,
Who saidt: "Gott knows I meant somedings vhen foorst dis buch I writ,
Boot Goot only wise vot das buch means now—for I hafe fergotten it!"[15]

Yet with all this difference, the great mediæval schoolman and the German philosopher have some common characteristics. Both alike were vigorous and original thinkers; both had made an extensive study of ancient Greek philosophers, seizing their meaning and setting it forth with a new force and vitality. Both alike had thought out a large and ordered system, a world in which they could tread with sure steps and serene confidence. Both alike have lofty ideals and pure moral teaching. And, whatever objections may be brought against some of the opinions, neither can ever be accused of skepticism, or pessimism, or materialism.

One obvious point of analogy is the unity and comparative simplicity of their respective philosophical systems. In the scholastic philosophy the same principles and the same formulæ find an application in the most widely different and distinct subjects. Thus the composition of matter and form, as two distinct and correlative elements is seen alike in the material world, in the lowest forms of life, in the nature of man and in the supernatural region of the sacramental system. Much the same may be said of the distinction between *actus* and *potentia*, or of that principle of Proculus which found its chief application in the scholastic analysis of human knowledge. And in like manner the Hegelian "Dialektik" provides one common formula as the law of life and progress in the whole world of thought and being. Turn where we may in Hegel's voluminous writings, we are still confronted by the working of the same principles. In the science of logic, in material nature, in the wide and varied field of history, in the changing systems of philosophy or religion, we still find the same three stages or moments, the same *concordantia discordantium*, or the blending of contradictory forces in a higher unity.

It is true that this same dialectic formula, with its corresponding axioms regarding the identity of Being and Nothing, and the identity of Thought and Being, is in direct conflict with some of the cherished tenets of Catholic philosophy. And this may be considered as the head and front of Hegel's offending. For there is certainly nothing in his teaching that has been more resolutely

[15] Als Hegel auf dem Todbette lag, sagte er: "Nur Einer hat mich verstanden, "aber gleich darauf fügte er verdriesslich hinzu: "Und der hat mich auch nicht verstanden." Heine, "Zur Geschlichte der Religion und Philosophie in Deutschland," Buch III.

rejected or made the subject of more relentless ridicule. To some this identity of contradictories must surely seem a startling novelty, unworthy of serious consideration. Yet, strange to say, it was first put forward by one of the founders of Greek philosophy; for Hegel has clearly borrowed it from his master Heraclitus. Or as Matthew Arnold puts the matter, "Hegel seized a single pregnant sentence of Heraclitus and cast it, with a thousand striking applications, into the world of modern thought."[16] And, it is only fair to add, Hegel himself frankly allows his obligations to the Greek philosopher. For when he comes to treat of the doctrines of Heraclitus, in his "History of Philosophy," he exclaims: "Here we see land," adding significantly that he has adopted all the Greek author's principles in his own "Logic."[17] St. Thomas, on the other hand, when he comes across one of these sayings of Heraclitus, in his comments on the Metaphysics, apparently agrees with Aristotle in regarding it as incredible.[18]

Yet, strange as it may seem, there is something in the main lines of the scholastic method that presents a curious analogy to the Hegelian Dialectic. In the popular conception of scholasticism, the first place is generally given to the use of formal syllogistic reasoning. But, though it is true that this plays an important part, especially in the pages of the later scholastic writers, it is by no means the chief characteristic of the mediæval methods. In St. Thomas and Scotus and the other great masters of the school, the most distinctive feature is surely the continued balancing of contrary arguments on every question that comes under discussion. And the conclusion results not simply from the premises of a syllogism, but from the counterpoise of opposing principles. Every article in the "Summa" has its array of objection and answers, and the balance is struck in the body of the article, not always by simply rejecting the objections, but rather by allowing them some force and bringing the whole into harmony by means of some subtle or profound distinction. If we turn to the larger and more elaborate articles of the "Quaestiones Disputatae," we may see this yet more plainly. For here the conclusion is often preceded by two series of objections from opposite quarters.

As some recent writers have shown, this method apparently owes its origin to the "Sic et Non" of Abelard, wherein the opposing arguments were brought together, but were left without a solution.

In much the same way we may regard the Kantian "antimonies"

---

[16] Spinoza and the Bible, "Essays in Criticism," p. 281.

[17] "Hier sehen wirl Land; es ist kein Satz des Heraklit, den ich nicht in meine Logik aufgenommen." Hegel's Werke, Vol. XIII., p. 328.

[18] In lib. IV. Metaphysic, lectio vi.

as the source of Hegel's Dialectic, which seeks to blend the two contradictories in a higher unity. Let us not be mistaken. We are by no means suggesting that the mediæval and modern methods are identical. It is merely a question of resemblance or analogy. What may be the source of this resemblance is another matter, on which there is room for difference of opinion. Some may possibly consider it a case of accidental coincidence. But there is some reason to believe that, after all, the root lies deeper. If we are not much mistaken, the mediæval method has its foundation in facts which are also the real basis of Hegel's theory. In a word, every truth is made up of diverse elements blended together in unity, or of opposing forces that must be held in equilibrium. Or if we turn to the higher mysteries of religion, we find Cardinal Newman saying of the doctrine of the Trinity, "The Catholic truth in question is made up of a number of separate propositions, each one of which, if maintained without the rest, is a heresy."[19] And it is not too much to say that the whole history of heresies and of doctrinal definitions continually offers fresh illustrations of this principle, *e. g.*, in Nestorius and Eutyches, as in Sabellius and Arius. It is the same in other and lower fields. In every form of life and activity we find a similar oscillation between two opposite poles, dogmatism and skepticism in speculation, despotism and anarchy in politics, layism and rigorism in morals. Account for them as we may, we cannot get rid of these facts. Nor can we doubt that this is the source of the systematic balancing of arguments on either side, and the subtle distinction allowing each its due weight, that is the distinctive feature of the scholastic method. And surely no one who is familiar with the writings of Hegel, and knows how he was wont to dwell on these familiar examples in natural and political changes, or how he too boldly ventures into the mysteries of religion, can doubt that this is the reality which he seeks to seize and set forth in his dialectic principle.

In saying this we must not be taken to admit the accuracy or adequacy of the Hegelian formula. If it be not the empty paradox which it appears to most of its hostile critics, it is still likely enough that the truth it contains is, to say the least, overstrained and overstated. We fear to refine too much or to indulge in idle fancy. But we may venture to observe that in thus carrying it to an excess Hegel does but furnish a fresh illustration of his own fundamental principle. He has dwelt with his wonted force on the facts that seem to show the working of the dialectic process as he considers it, in every region of thought and being. All that is finite is in movement; life bears within it the seed of death; every state or

[19] "Development on Christian Doctrine," p. 11.

every action, when carried to its extreme, passes into its own opposite. Anarchy runs into despotism; the extremes of joy and sorrow are nigh to one another. *Summum jus summa injuria.*[20] And the history of his philosophy, with its conflict of the Hegelians of the left wing and the right, and the destructive critics who came forth from the school to pursue a course at variance with the master's main teaching may well seem to be but another instance in illustration.

But if, as is likely enough, the German philosopher has made too much of this double aspect of truth and this union or equilibrium of opposite forces, may we not say that in our own schools the matter has hitherto attracted too little attention? The schoolmen have proceeded by the careful balancing of opposing arguments. And doctrinal development has been wrought out by the ceaseless strife of contradictory opinions and heresies. But, for the most part, we have been content to take the facts, without seeking to get beyond them and grasp the underlying principle. Yet if any candid student will carefully consider the matter, he will probably be ready to allow that there is more than meets the eye in this warring of opposing forces. Let him take, for instance, the doctrinal definition of Chalcedon, and consider the course of the controversy which issued in that luminous statement of the whole Catholic dogma. This instance is specially worthy of note, not only because here the two sides of the truth are so distinctly marked, but also by reason of the fact that here, besides the opposite heresies smitten by this two-edged sword, there were two Catholic schools in the controversy. One of these was led to lay so much stress on one side of the doctrine that some of its language might almost seem to give some countenance to the Monophysite error; while the attitude taken up by some of the other school laid them open to a suspicion of favoring Nestorianism. Both the definition and the controversy from which it issued serve to show the need of recognizing both sides of a truth and of preserving the diverse forces in due equilibrium.

This consideration suggests a further reflection on the subject of errors in philosophy or religion—a reflection which is, indeed, one of the main motives of the conciliatory attitude adopted in these pages. Possibly some zealous guardians of orthodoxy may be inclined to view this tenderness for a non-Catholic philosopher with some misgiving. And a dispassionate comparison of Hegel with the schoolmen may perhaps be regarded as an implied admission of the German writer's doctrine on the principle of contradiction. If only to prevent this possible misconception, it may be worth while

[20] Cf. Encyklopadie 81. Werke, Vol. VI., p. 152 ff.

to state our own view on this matter. It has at least the merit of being based on the principles of Catholic philosophy. And, if we may venture to say so, the opposite method of treating heterodox systems as something wholly evil always seems to us to imply the unconscious admission of a sort of intellectual Manicheism. Every being as such is good; and the existence of pure undiluted evil is impossible. Even so, it seems to us every body of doctrine that holds sway in the minds of men must needs contain some elements of truth. For falsehood, like evil, is a negation; and the existence of pure genuine undiluted error is impossible. The most degraded forms of paganism have retained some truths of natural religion or, maybe, some faint traces of primitive revelation. All the sects, however far from the centre of Catholic unity, bear with them some remnants of Christian doctrine; and all the philosophical systems from Thales to Schopenhauer contain some of the true principles of divine philosophy.

Unfortunately, controversialists generally lay stress on the errors alone and pay little or no heed to the better elements contained in the systems of their opponents. Hence it is hardly too much to say that for the average student who forms his notions from the text-books of his masters, heresiarchs and founders of philosophies are nothing more than monstrous personifications of their real or supposed errors. Who knows or cares what Catholic doctrines were retained by Pelagius or Luther, or what principles of sound philosophy were still preserved by Hume or Hegel? Yet these things must surely be taken into account, if we would fain form a just estimate of the men or of their systems. Nor is this all. We may even go further and discern some germ of truth, however disguised and distorted, in the very errors themselves. Not only do the most abandoned heretics hold fast to the faith in other matters, but for the most part the heresy itself is a truth that has not been grasped in all its bearings, but is isolated and thus strained or distorted.

It is to be feared that the champions of orthodoxy are too often content to lay stress on the particular dogma which has been denied by the heretic, without paying attention to the true principles which he has thus misapprehended. This was seen in the case of the controversy in the time between the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon. And it is not less conspicuous in the common treatment of modern Pantheism. It is well to lay stress on the objective reality of material things and the infinite distance between the creature and the Creator. But we could wish that some other parts of Catholic teaching were brought out more prominently in this connection. The conception of creation should be completed by

the profound scholastic speculations on conservation and the Divine *concursus*, and by the teaching that God is not only the maker but the *causa exemplaris*, and the meanest material creature is but an expression of the Divine ideas, shadowing forth the perfections of Him in whom "we live and move and have our being."

It might help to clear the air of much needless strife and barren controversy if this principle were more frequently remembered in our doctrinal discussions. For the full and frank recognition of the truth that is held by our opponents would not endanger any Catholic doctrine, while it might do much to provide some common ground and draw us all together. And, to return to our more immediate object, the application of the same principles would have an equally happy effect in the field of philosophy. Doubts and difficulties and matters of contention would still be there in abundance; but at least the strain and stress of the situation would be sensibly lightened. And devout disciples of the mediæval masters of Catholic philosophy and admirers of the great thinkers of modern Germany would happily find that they have much in common when once they cease to waste their strength in barren strife and censorious criticism. Once more, there is no need of breaking with the past or of condemning the present. We can hold fast to the old Catholic philosophy of St. Thomas and St. Augustine; for it is not dead but living, and is yet capable of further growth and progress. And at the same time, following the example of the mediæval masters, we need not fear to adopt whatever of good and true has fallen from the lips of later teachers of our own time. All truth is ours, no matter who has said it. *Ne quaeras quis hoc dixerit; sed ad quid dicatur attende.* In this spirit we have ventured to attempt the task of making a candid and dispassionate study of the writings of Hegel and the schoolmen.

W. H. Kent, O. S. C.

Bayswater, London, England.

HOME RULE AND MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S ZOLLVEREIN.

AT the termination of August political parties in England were still in dire confusion on account of Mr. Chamberlain's revolt from the doctrine of Free Trade. The importance of this departure for us rests exclusively on its bearing on the prospects of Home Rule. He is the declared enemy of that policy, and if he be a man of great influence on the electorate, his opposition must count for much. There no doubt is a crumb of comfort in the result of the Barnard Castle election, at which the Government candidate was defeated.[1] The bewilderment and alarm of the masses of the people, just after the formal announcement of the economic doctrine of "The dear loaf," as a means to secure increased wages and provide a fund for pensions in old age, do not seem to have so utterly demoralized them as Mr. Chamberlain and his admirers had hoped. He was the only "strong man," his was the only cool head in the crisis—which, by the by, was a crisis of his own creation—and the frightened people had no resource except to turn to him. At all events, the election has this value: we see from it that the masses are not moving to him any more than the economists.

About the end of June or beginning of July he solemnly warned the members of the Constitutional Club against Home Rule. It was scotched, not killed, he told them, and would again enter the arena. There was no need of a prophet to declare a secret which the magazines and the daily and weekly papers were discussing as a practical question. The very air was vibrating with the electricity released by the Land Purchase Bill. It was not an accident that two measures of such supreme consequence to Ireland were linked in the public mind. Without accepting Mr. A. Balfour's opinion that the Land Question is the history of Ireland, we may allow it so much value as to say it expresses partly the truth—this much, that the anarchy which was embodied in ferocious enactments and which exhibited itself in every form of social disorganization was mainly due to the exercise of powers over the soil and its inhabitants by men devoid of conscience and humanity. Mr. Balfour did not express the fact in this bald way, but he said what was practically the same when he stated that the history of the Land Question was the history of Ireland. What he failed to grasp was that apart from and above the question of the land was the political sense and the spiritual conception included in the word nationhood.

If the Irish were to be kept forever in subjection—and this, we

[1] The Argyle election is more important still as auguring a return to Mr. Gladstone's policy in its entirety.

submit, is a policy no one could advocate any more than he would slavery in the West India Islands or a reënactment of the disabilities of Dissenters—there should have been no interference with the social conditions prevailing during the reigns of Anne, George I. and George II. A people cannot be half emancipated. If you desire that they should be slaves, leave them nothing you can take away from them. This was the way the Irish landlords dealt with their tenants—and they were successful as long as they could so deal with them—but unfortunately there is a meddling, insolent, international conscience which condemns the recklessness of States in handing over duties and obligations to the cruel and licentious, the interested and corrupt. In addition, there is a certain public spirit latent among the people at large which may be aroused by appeals from men in whom they have confidence. As the Irish people, or the survivors of the triennial famines of two centuries, gradually found themselves in possession of a certain amount of political power, they began to use it to widen and deepen the foundations of their social strength and to aim at the realization of some respectable idea of individual life. Europe and America, all the world looked on, and so those wretched Irish squireens could not be allowed to disgrace the Empire by their pranks. When in their fatuity they allowed the *Times* to champion their cause in its own manner, to put them in the witness-box, where they disclosed nothing but their brogue and their bad English, their planter-like brutality and unconsciousness of any rights which their tenants possessed under the sky, they committed class suicide. As a result they were to be destroyed as a social and political power sooner or later, and fortunately for them, the Government of Tories and other enemies of the Irish people in bestowing the death stroke on the landlords as a political party made their fortunes as individuals. But with the destruction of this class as a political party or power springs up of necessity the right of all other classes to political and social emancipation. The Irish people have obtained too much to be kept in a state of tutelage forever, as a transition from a state of slavery which as late as 1886 Lord Salisbury pronounced to have been made perpetual by the destiny that had in similar circumstances surrounded the Dutch with Hottentots to hew wood and draw water for them. Home Rule must follow the policy of land transfer if content is to remain for any time, and this because it is the completion and fulfilment of the policy of land transfer.

The question has come back to life in no uncertain manner. We are not, indeed, prepared to discover hidden meanings in the King's address to his people in Ireland, when he impresses on them the importance of working in union to develop the resources of their

country with such means and powers of local government as they possess; but we are very strongly inclined to think it would be to him a most pleasing duty to give his assent to a large measure of self-government. The separate nationality was recognized by his Majesty with a heartiness to cause satisfaction, and, we think, to give birth to hopes that the acknowledgment will not end in an acquiescence with a sentiment.

At any rate, since the Land Bill was spoken of the political idea came into prominence in various quarters and was looked at by men from different points of view as something within the range of practical politics. It is only among the Liberal Unionists, indeed, whose *raison d'être* is the denial of Home Rule, that the present political relations between England and Ireland must be maintained at any cost. It is rather a severe comment on this, that the respectable wing of the party, the Conservatives, are not quite in accord with all the Imperialist aspirations of the section just named. Sir Edward Clarke, one of the ablest lawyers in the last Parliament, was invited by the executive council of the Brighton Tories to stand for a seat which became vacant by the retirement of the sitting member about the first week of August. The significance of this invitation is that Sir Edward Clarke was the most outspoken opponent of the South African war, the most trenchant critic of Mr. Chamberlain's policy, the man who had made the striking appeal to Mr. Chamberlain during the height of the hostilities to retire for six months from public life, while at the same time assuring him that peace would be the instantaneous result of his retirement. We need not despair with such signs as the election at Barnard Castle and the invitation to Sir Edward Clarke pressing on us in the midst of the uncertainty and alarm of the masses of the English people; it is not so clear that "the strong man" is going to sweep the country at the next general election. We are aware that he has promises of immense resources from the South African magnates, and we fear that between the wealth of these plutocrats and the fears of the working man about his future that the enemy of Ireland will obtain a majority, but its influence, it is hoped, will only be temporary.

At any rate, he has committed himself to a fixed hostility to Home Rule; he has even gone away from that coquetting with Mr. Gladstone's first measure alluded to in Lord Coleridge's article in the *North American Review* for June to the fartherest pole of antagonism. Taking him as a great influence in Imperial politics, he should be an object on which the united strength of the Liberal-Radical party and the Irish Parliamentary party must be precipitated. Though we are not amongst those who think him a statesman, we see in him the most formidable opponent of the Irish demand. As we have

said, the English people will look for guidance in this time of divided counsels to the man who seems to know his own mind as the one to lead them out of a position of difficulty and danger.

It is to be regretted that we do not possess authoritative documents[2] which could be published for the electors in every part of England concerning the events that led to the war in South Africa and authoritative information on the manner in which it was conducted. It would be well if we possessed some materials for forming a judgment on the status of the Transvaal and its sister republic and their relations to the Cape Government before the war. If Mr. Chamberlain be a man totally devoid of political conception and foresight, as we think him to be, we ought to have the means of proving this from the records of his dealings with the Boer administration and the Cape Government. For instance, was he the dupe of Mr. Rhodes? It must not be supposed that vast schemes are sufficient to prove that he who conceives them is a statesman; madness has been known to form large conceptions; vanity united to a quick and restless, but not capacious mind has before now busied itself in the disturbance of order. The unsettlement or resettlement of institutions has been the reformer's hobby since the dawn of political society. The mob had its demagogues against Moses, the little States of Greece were theatres of incessant turmoil; not even the law-abiding spirit of the Romans saved them from the agitator who became a dictator, the popular leader who became a despot. The people should be led to believe that Mr. Chamberlain is a charlatan.

Who would bear with Gracchus inveighing against sedition? But the three kingdoms must submit to Mr. Chamberlain when he says that the Home Rulers are rebels: though he tried to incite the Irish to desperate measures by saying to a great English meeting that government in Ireland was of the kind exercised by the Russians at the worst times in Poland, and the Austrians when they made Venetia one vast prison. Such language if spoken in Dublin or in an Irish country town, under Mr. Arthur Balfour's administration of the Irish office, by an Irish member of Parliament, would obtain for the latter "a plank bed" in the nearest prison; if it were employed by an Irish magistrate, it would, in addition to the plank bed, cause him to be superseded in the commission of peace; if it were used by an ordinary and unofficial tribune of the people, the speaker would carry the marks of a policeman's baton to the jail.[3]

---

[2] These have come to light since the above was written.

[3] While on this topic we must mention that during the time referred to in the text it was said Mr. Balfour would not dare to act towards Englishmen as he was dealing with Irishmen. The reply was, if they spoke in

We must impress on every one to whom these lines shall go that the administration which succeeded the first Home Rule Government after the defeat of 1886 and the present administration were and are the most lawless and tyrannical since the Government of the Six Acts, which deprived the English people of every vestige of public liberty. It was only the other day that Englishmen, meeting to express their view on the continuance of that South African war which when the historian takes it up shall be written in the crimson characters of the Thirty Years' War of the sixteenth century or the burning words of the desolation of the Carnatic, were scattered by savage mobs with the approval of the first Ministers of the Crown. There is no good in mincing matters; we are not, as a great countryman might have said in view of the events of to-day, we are not to go into transports of mimic gratitude because a Land Purchase Bill has been passed, or a King has visited the country or a Lord Lieutenant is to be made a Marquis, or soldiers are to wear the shamrock on St. Patrick's Day. We say the whole force of the Liberal party and the Irish nation must be marshalled against the Government, of which the man who has wasted the wide territories of a simple race, religious according to their lights, is a member. The delusion which carries the electorate blindfold into the service of the Unionist league is that the old Radical who used to denounce the privileged classes as the enemies of liberty and progress, as persons who for their own selfish ends would have denied education to the people to the last, and who, when compelled to grant it, so maimed the concession that it came as a curse rather than as a blessing, the delusion is that he still stands for their cause amid the ranks of the high-born and the wealthy. He is among his new companions, they are led to understand; he is among those who toil not, it is said, not because he is faithless to the old creed, but because traitors in the party yielded to an association of crime and outrage and rebellion organized in Ireland against all who were loyal to the connection with England. It was not he or his fellow Liberal-Unionists, he persuades the people, who deserted the great party which had obtained every social and political and religious right by which the humble man is made in all essential things equal to the greatest noble, but it was the unscrupulous knot of place-seekers round a leader in his dotage and their unworthy supporters who betrayed the Liberal cause and endangered the stability of the

Ireland in the same manner as those batoned and imprisoned had done, he would. Mr. Shaw-Lefevre, an ex-Cabinet Minister, tested the Chief Secretary's *bona fides* by going over and addressing a public meeting of the incriminated kind. He returned to England unscathed. What is but a choleric word in the captain is flat blasphemy in the private; but here it was not even regarded as a choleric word; it was constitutional language.

Empire. And this interested representation of his going to the side of the men he had countless times assailed was accepted by the majority of the electors in England even when Mr. Gladstone's influence was higher than at any time since he took up Home Rule. We wish that the American people and the electors of the Three Kingdoms should take in the full significance of the forces supporting or opposing Home Rule—we do not mean in all their complexity, but with a sufficiently comprehensive and intelligent grasp, because from such a perception may arise the influence to overthrow this mischievous Minister.

Now, we may say that under the most favorable aspect in which we can present the Home Rule cause the majority of the English electors went against Mr. Gladstone and against the other two kingdoms and the Principality[4] at both elections.

Morally, no doubt, the judgment of Scotland and Wales in the controversy is of incomparably higher value than that of England, if we can call hers a judgment at all; for who has ever listened to a man's being a judge in his own cause? Yet justice might be done in a rare case by an individual, but no one fit to remain a minute outside a lunatic asylum could suppose a powerful nation capable of equitable judgment concerning the affairs of a weaker one, helpless in her grasp and whose interests were in a greater or less degree in conflict with her own. Let it be borne in mind all along that the prominent consideration of every follower of Mr. Gladstone from the English ranks is: Whether self-government can be accorded to Ireland without detriment to England. This sense of the relation between the two kingdoms was by no one expressed with a more cynical frankness than by a Home Rule Premier, Lord Rosebery. This statesman declared that "Home Rule could not be conferred on Ireland until the consent of 'the predominant partner' was obtained," and this, he explained, meant a majority not of the Imperial Parliament, but a majority of English members of the Lower House. A division of the Liberal party agrees with him.

This, then, from an accredited source of Home Rule Liberalism is what the supporters of Mr. Gladstone's policy must bend themselves to the task of achieving. Either Home Rule must be indefinitely postponed, or the Home Rulers must capture the majority of seats in England; and meanwhile the Tories and the Liberal Unionists who out-Herod them in the establishment of an irresponsible militarism at home and the nourishing of a wild craze for aggressive expansion abroad may enjoy the fruits of office to their hearts content—the one section may pursue titles with wealth annexed, the other may hunt for wealth with titles annexed. At first sight one

[4] Wales.

would think all this could have gone on nicely. The Government is in power with an immense majority in the Commons, while the House of Lords is their own; and so rich men could become men of rank, whilst aristocrats could become plutocrats; there was no Irish bugbear to cause discomfort—all was serene and the sky was blue. Why, then, should the Colonial Secretary have flung his bolt at such a time?

But the right honorable gentleman knows that the Fools' Paradise was in danger of being devastated; for hour by hour dark and sinister tidings were coming from the unhappy provinces his ambition, his want of knowledge and his audacity had handed over to the powers by whose aid weak nations are destroyed and strong ones sent upon the road to ruin. He deemed it necessary to divert the public attention by some new and striking issue.

We should not have bestowed so much time on Mr. Chamberlain were it not that we regard him as the special enemy of Irish autonomy and because we wish to supplement some things omitted from Lord Coleridge's article already referred to. There is a principle in human nature that makes men the determined enemies of those they wronged. There was no man who took a more decided part in dividing the Liberal party and checking the conversion of the English people to Home Rule than the Minister for the Colonies. Mr. Parnell had hurt that insatiable and restless vanity which, like a familiar spirit, is forever driving Mr. Chamberlain from one idea to another, one plan to another, one policy to another. He was impatient of the influence and authority of Mr. Gladstone, which he thought stood between him and the first place in the Liberal party. The Irish leader held the balance of power between the parties; he was the Warwick of Ministries. Mr. Chamberlain asked him[5] to unite in shelving Mr. Gladstone. The Irish leader refused. Mr. Chamberlain asked for letters of recommendation to politicians and associations in Ireland, on the strength of which he and Sir Charles Dilke would start on a campaign through Ireland. It is said, as the consideration for such letters, he offered, on becoming Prime Minister, to grant whatever terms the Irish would demand as to the form and extent of self-government. As we are so far dealing with the right honorable gentleman's conduct as an important element in the history of the movement within the area of accepted party politics, we cannot avoid offering suggestions on certain pronouncements made by him since he became a Unionist. Mr. Parnell declined to give him the letters.

[5] The particulars of this intrigue have not been fully disclosed, but what is said above is public property. We do not know to what extent a *cave* had been secured within the Liberal party pending the coöperation of Mr. Parnell.

We must now go back a little—only a few months, in fact, from the date of the proposal. Lord Carnarvon, who was Lord Lieutenant in 1885, had come to the conclusion that some considerable measure of legislative power over her own local or internal affairs must of necessity be conferred on Ireland, if the stability of the Empire were to be preserved and the good name of England rehabilitated before the civilized world. A negotiation between the noble Earl and Mr. Parnell was entered into with the consent of the Prime Minister, Lord Salisbury. All the world knew that this was going on; what was not known was how far Lord Carnarvon was the agent of the Premier and the limit of his powers of concession to Ireland. We beg the reader's attention to this matter.

It must be plain if the Tories were to settle the question of political relations with Ireland, Liberalism as a political influence would have become a thing of the past, a mere memory illuminated, no doubt, with brilliant passages to be ranted in the speeches of schoolboys in their debating societies; to be debated with the great question: "Whether Phillip, having crossed the frontier of an alien State and the Herald having made proclamation, was Demosthenes justified in rising?"[6] or "Ought the Judices have convicted Milo"—taking Cicero's presentation of the facts for the accused as substantially correct and having regard to the notoriously infamous character of Clodius? or whether the majority of the Court were right in Hampden's case—having regard to the precedents and the analogies from the muster by the land forces? With such questions Whig-Liberalism would be classed as a political power in the event named.

It is idle to suppose that the Liberal party would have seen one day of power since if Lord Salisbury had risen to the opportunity afforded him by a man fresh in the experience of governing Ireland within the Act of Union. To our Liberal friends this is a consideration of moment; to the Nonconformists, whose religious conscience does not so entirely overshadow their political conscience as to prevent them from accepting the support of Irish Papists on a Burial Bill, on a Welsh Disestablishment Bill, on a Public Worship Regulation Bill, or on any measure tending to make the Dissenter equal to the Churchman, we raise the reminder that the Tory and the Churchman, the squire and the parson would have been ruling England since 1885, and probably till 1995, if Ireland had been reconciled by Lord Salisbury. If the Liberals and the Nonconformists can point to a single measure widening public liberty for English-

[6] Our readers will remember that this was the issue into which with infinite skill the great advocate turned the unanswerable impeachment by Æschines. No one would rise.

men and making personal liberty stronger and clearer passed without the aid of Irishmen, and above all Catholic Irishmen, and the passionate force of the desire of justice of these, working behind their representatives, they will tell of Acts of Parliament omitted from the journals of both Houses.

It is well known that Mr. Chamberlain has not one scintilla of that historical knowledge which belongs to philosophy, not one rudimentary principle of that political speculativeness which is the condition of those broad and masterly conceptions which constitute the science of government, and both of which—the philosophy of history and the philosophy of politics—are essential to the formation of a statesman's mind, yet he has that intense appreciation of historical facts lying in his way and political examples readily grasped which belong to the quick, ardent and limited understanding. He orates and writes despatches about "Suzerainty" before the war, without knowing what the word means; he talks of "Zolverein" until we are reminded of the one clown who imposes on his father by the word "ergo" "I say ergo," and the other clown who criticizes a speaker who uses the word "vent," as follows: "He heard the word from some great man and now he vents it on a fool," but he is keen enough to feel the forces near him. He saw what the Liberals had effected during the whole period from the beginning of the great Reform agitation by the aid of Ireland; he held in his hand, as every one held, the fact strong and portentous of the marvelous growth of the Home Rule movement in power in a few years. He conceived the idea that with such an ally or an instrument he would be able to sway the destinies of Britain more absolutely than Walpole had done or Pitt. He saw that if the Carnarvon negotiations should succeed, he might as well abandon the great theatre of imperial politics and return to the useful but not glorious occupation of presiding over the paving, lighting and sanitation of Birmingham. No career in world-wide politics lay before him if Home Rule were granted by the Tories.

It was then he approached Parnell and met with the rebuff which led to the inspiration of his later-day policy towards Ireland. And in this no one can really think that Mr. Parnell erred in judgment. We may venture to tell the tale of what might have been. Mr. Parnell and the Irish party united with Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Charles Dilke would have succeeded in preventing a Liberal administration under Mr. Gladstone holding power—they could not have prevented Mr. Gladstone being sent for to form an administration. The result would be that instead of holding the balance between the great parties in the kingdom, Mr. Parnell and his followers would be tied to an inconsiderable family clique distrusted by

every Liberal for whom party allegiance was a bond of duty or of honor. Disappointed by the result, Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Jesse Collings and the other members of the group would repent and beg to be taken back into the fold, but their Irish dupes would become the object of universal derision, as knaves who had obtained influence by pretending to patriotism and fools who could not use their influence wisely.

Possibly the right honorable gentleman may think it was fortunate that the Irish leader rejected his overtures, that had the latter not done so he would not have had the opportunity of sending his name through the Colonies as a household word and would not now have been standing as the still strong man among leaders in dismay and dissension and before a people dreading what the future may disclose. We cannot admire the judgment of the nation which looks to Mr. Chamberlain as a great and consistent statesman, but we can regard it with alarm; for upon it depends all forces now available for bringing Home Rule before Parliament with any prospect of success.

We know very well that the English democracy can be moved to enthusiasm for justice and humanity when appealed to by one in whom they have confidence. At the great election of 1868 the boroughs and cities were swept by the workingmen going to the polls with the battle-cry of "Justice to Ireland!" Again, when the great leader fulminated over the land against the deeds done in Bulgaria, the people, maddened at the account of what had been undergone by men, women and children in a distant land, united to them by no tie of race, or kindred, of language, of history, of religion, no bond but of that humanitywhich melts the heart at the tale of suffering, rouses its indignation against injustice and turns all its blood to flame at the mention of inexpressible wrongs, maddened at the account of these things, the people flung down the cold and insolent class government that had encouraged them.

But who is to reach the people now? We are informed that the cause of Ireland, which is the cause of the English democracy, now, as surely as at any time for seventy or eighty years, is to sink in abeyance in the campaign Mr. Chamberlain has provoked. In one sense we hold the Liberals excusable for not giving it the old prominence. In the first place, those who call themselves the Liberal League, and who seem to possess a sort of Birmingham-electioneering-agent activity, have expunged Home Rule from what they call the "slate"—this League, we say, must be taken into recokoning. Their proper place is with Mr. Chamberlain and the Liberal Unionists, but they refuse to go over because they think there is a better chance of office when their own betrayed party comes into power

than among aristocrats in an administration headed by the great house of Barnacle. Next the party itself, of which the acknowledged leaders are Lord Spencer in the House of Lords and Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman in the House of Commons, are placed in this difficulty: that Mr. Chamberlain, the master spirit of wire-pulling, ostentatiously threw down the gauntlet to Home Rule, and he selected the moment he was pronouncing an invective of innuendo against Free Trade for the performance. Not a single act of Mr. Chamberlain but must be watched. The occasion we refer to was that when the Constitutional Club presented him with an address and settled itself with due obsequiousness to hear him on "the dear-loaf" which would increase rents if the prophets of Protection are right in their economics.[7]

We certainly have no desire to play his game, but the cause must not be allowed to wait. Every hour is bringing the Irish nation nearer to death; emigration is bleeding her white. If this is to continue, we wonder who in a few years' time will be living on the lands bought by Mr. Wyndham's peasant proprietors under the bill to pacify Ireland. It is almost a word of ill omen, this word pacify. As we write it down—*facient solitudinem vocant pacem* echoes down the centuries since Tacitus described the masterful and appalling policy by which what Pliny called the immense majesty of the Roman peace was established in so many places. The echoes reverberate from shore to shore of Ireland and from century to century. In good Catholic days "the mere Irishman" was a beast of chase called "a wood kerne," to be hunted as they hunt tigers now in India, as they make forest toils in Eastern Europe, as they used to beat woods in France for the wild boar and coverts in England for the stag. Under Queen Mary and her Spanish husband the districts called Leix and Offaly are described in English State papers as full of houses in the midst of good pastures and well-tilled fields and traversed by excellent roads, but their Majesties' armies came and "pacified"[8] them, so that they might be colonized by English settlers. Well, ever since they are known as Kings county and Queens county. We shall say no more than that this is not a question to be decided according to religious belief or opinion, this hunting of wood kerns. In England, indeed, the Catholics may be the natural allies of the Tories, but the Tories of Ireland are a mere

[7] We doubt this result as a permanent one, even though the Birmingham Tariff Committee says the taxation of wheat will bring back to cultivation thousands of acres. Increased taxes on food would send the workingmen to America.

[8] We wonder was it for giving shelter to the Protestants who fled to Ireland from the persecution in England. At any rate the Irish Catholics behaved in that scandalously humane way towards the English Protestants.

revolutionary faction, enemies of law and order in all ranks, partial and prejudiced as magistrates, seditious as pressmen, untamed savages in the lower walks of life—men whose motto in business of any kind is the exclusion of Papists, whose pastime on the great festivals of their political creed is murder and arson. Consequently, the Irish people have no allies with whom they can safely act except the great party which made the restoration of their lost legislature a Cabinet question and a perpetual issue. Nevertheless, the cause must not wait even for the great Liberal party. Now, to this point we must address ourselves in a few sentences and, we think, in a fair and reasonable manner.

Before the starting of the movement we all know as that of Home Rule, but on the very eve of it, proposals for the readjustment of the connection had frequently been suggested both in Ireland and England. Even in the early forties Lord John Russell seems to have framed a federal arrangement. Not an uncommon idea was that of a system of rotary Parliaments, Dublin having its turn; and this is in the main the scheme advocated in the article in the *Nineteenth Century* for June contributed to the subject by Sir Henry Drummond Wolff. A remark he there makes is worth recalling: He considers that the restricted legislative power conferred on the local legislature in the constitution, he sketches, would be a foundation for the system of Imperial federation with which, he informs us, Mr. Chamberlain is credited. The possibility of any such solution as this through Mr. Chamberlain may at once be dismissed. The latter has nailed his colors to the mast: no form of self-government for Ireland; though it is said that to preserve a certain consistency on account of the offer made to Mr. Parnell he was prepared when the Unionists first went into power to support a system of provincial parliaments[9] in Ireland as distinguished from a national legislature. Anything less statesmanlike and more malicious it would be impossible to conceive. The provincial parliament of Connaught would not possess one useful element of local government because the area is too large and the interests are too diverse; it would not possess a single principle of national government because it had no power to control the other provinces. The same might be said with regard to each of the other provinces, and so each of them would stand in the Imperial system as a monument of legislative impotence. Their counsels would be without influence at Westminster and the result would be that, exasperated beyond endurance, they would employ their resources and their time in agitating for a national parliament.

We frankly confess that in our opinion the situation has been

[9] That is, a parliament for each of the four provinces of Ireland.

changed by the Land Purchase Bill. The administration of a somewhat similar measure announced by Mr. Gladstone in 1886 was to be in the hands of an Irish executive responsible to an Irish parliament. This was beyond all question supreme practical statesmanship. The landlords recklessly refused the offer to purchase such of their estates as were in the hands of tenants entitled to the benefit of the Land Law Act of 1881 or the entire estates if they preferred to dispose of them to the Imperial Government. It cannot be said that they feared the administration in this behalf of a Home Rule Parliament, since all that was needed, if they could not trust such an authority, was to sell out. So far from their refusal to accept the measure, receiving sympathy from Englishmen at first disposed to grant rather liberal terms, the latter came to look upon them as hopelessly irreconcilable, and suggested with grim sarcasm that they should be handed over to the tender mercies of Parnell's Parliament. For their own sake and that of the country, it was a pity they had not been. Much suffering would have been escaped. Parnell himself, we think, would have dealt with them liberally; yet his was the hard mind and the inexorable spirit of political vindictiveness they had most to dread. We are convinced their own Parliament would have gone beyond the bounds of reason to gratify them as an inducement to stay in the country and join in building her up.

So sure are we of the spirit of the majority that if the Protestant Church had been disestablished by an Irish Parliament in which Catholics preponderated, there would have been no disendowment or hardly any disendowment. The establishment of religious equality for Protestant, Presbyterian, Catholic, Jew, what not, would be the aim of the majority. Can any one doubt it? A Jew at the earliest moment he was qualified to sit in the Corporation of Dublin was elected alderman for a ward so Catholic that it is doubtful if ten per cent. of the burgesses were of any other religion. A Jew would not have the ghost of a chance in any ward in which the Protestants were the majority at the time, and what is more, Alderman Harris, the Jew in question, carried on the business of a money-lender, a pursuit not calculated to make a man popular. It was simply because he was a Jew and to emphasize their boast that Irish Catholics alone among peoples never made Jews suffer civil or social disqualification that they elected him. We ourselves think it was a rather gratuitous act of liberality, but no one can despise the motive which prompted it.

But, as we were saying, if the Land measure of the Chief Secretary is to succeed, it can only be by making it the business of an Irish administration to carry out all its details one by one, to collect the instalments of purchase money and transmit them to the Ex-

chequer. The confidence Mr. Wyndham reposes in boards of administration is only equaled by his trust that the powers of nature will so watch over the interests of tenant-purchasers that one will see everywhere bursting granaries, healthy stock, overflowing milk pails and green crops so abundant that a large part must be given back as manure to the soil. It is to be feared that this picture does not foreshadow the things to come.

On another occasion we said administration by boards was the bane of Ireland. What does it mean? Simply that certain departments spend the money appropriated to all the branches of administration without any responsibility to the country, without regard for her interests and with the most sublime contempt for the opinion of the masses of her people. If any head of a department is heretic enough to consider it his duty to discharge his functions with a care for the public interest, he is got rid of in some way or other, either by being pensioned off, like Sir Thomas Brady from the Fisheries' Board; promoted like Sir Robert Hamilton from the important office of Under Secretary, or if an official of high and coördinate jurisdiction like Mr. Murrough O'Brien, simply omitted from a new appointment of his colleagues. Sir Robert Hamilton is not an Irishman; the other gentlemen named are Irish Protestants.

The scandals of the valuation office were at one time the subject of discussion. It is difficult to see how a board of this kind could be made serviceable to the interests of a political party, but this is the allegation. The gentleman responsible for the charge we have in view was not a Nationalist or a Catholic. He was an orthodox Whig, a Privy Councillor, a member of Parliament and connected by marriage with the Duke of Bedford and a some time Prime Minister, Lord John Russell, afterwards Earl Russell. The charge made by this right honorable gentleman was that the Revisers of valuation adjusted the values of the various townlands from time to time in such a manner, when there was a £12 franchise in counties, as to give a preponderance to the Tory interest. If the valuation of a holding were returned at £11 19 a year, there was no vote. Consequently a reduction to the extent of a few shillings might easily be made to deprive the tenants of a Whig landlord of the franchise, and by adding a few shillings to transfer the franchise to those of a Tory landlord. This could be accomplished without altering the general valuation of a division that constituted the valuation unit. That is to say, as long as the valuation of the entire unit remained the same, alterations in the component parts of it did not conflict with the rules of the Department. It was perfectly legal, however corrupt the motive. That the changes could be effected is indubitable; that they were effected is the charge.

The importance of a Board of Works for promoting improvements of all kinds cannot be overestimated in any country, but in a country whose inhabitants depended solely on natural agents for a livelihood, in comparison with it, all other departments may hardly be regarded as of any account. If a malicious spirit presided over this bureau in Ireland and had cast a spell on its administration, so as to bring about the effect that any work fairly well done should be work not wanted at all, or that any work needed, if attempted, should be done so badly as to be useless, we might have the explanation of its blundering and incompetence. Why, it was the laughing stock of all classes, who with that queer, wild humor common to the whole race, high and low, gentle and simple, the criminal extravagance and absurd performances of this Department, were forgiven for the merriment they provoked. And then it was so high and mighty, with its dwelling in cloudland, above opinion, certain to be backed by the Treasury benches in Parliament and the Castle at home, that it was well for the people they possessed this unconquerable sense of the ridiculous. We will go no further into these matters, but we may ask is it not time that the boards should be placed under a strong home government that will compel them to perform their work efficiently? We think so.

It is to such another irresponsible office the Chief Secretary is committing the administration of his Land Measure. There are certain considerations open to us from his account of some of the securities he holds forth for its successful working and the protection of the Imperial taxpayer from ultimate liability. From certain savings to be effected and from the appropriation of a definite amount coming to Ireland[10] he calculates a borrowing basis to the extent of two hundred millions sterling. We have in this fact ground for the application of Mr. Gladstone's principle of making the statutory parliament to be created under the Home Rule Bill of 1886 a buffer between the Irish tenant-purchaser and the Exchequer, and an agent for this last-named institution in collecting and remitting the instalments.

As the Land Purchase Bill settles the conditions of sale, the most useful and important part to be played by mere commissioners is withdrawn from the board. It is nothing more than a conveyance office so far as the transactions between landlords and tenants are concerned, that is to say, an office to prepare the instrument by which the title to the landlord's interest, whatever that may be, is

[10] This is a proportion to the sum granted to England in aid of education which is allotted to Ireland for local purposes. The Chief Secretary hypothecates it to indemnify the British tax-payers. The Irish tax-payer is of no account at all, though he pays the bill for landlords and tenants.

conveyed to the tenant-purchaser. It is not the business of this board to ascertain whether or not the *tenant*-purchaser proposes a payment beyond the value of what the landlord has to sell or to refuse assent even though the average purchase price the landlord is to receive, taking Ireland as a whole, is at the very least twice the value of the fee simple, the measure practically concludes the bargain. In a note there[11] is a reference to estates on which the tenants were in chronic arrears simply because it was only in exceptionally flourishing seasons that the rent could be paid. The landlords sold their holdings to the tenants under the Ashbourne Acts at an excessive price and under threat of eviction, a coercion stronger to the small farmer in Ireland than a long term of penal servitude.

It is out of the question but that numerous transactions of this kind took place under the measures just mentioned. It was the duty of the Commissioners to protect the tenants and the Exchequer against oppression of the tenants in the making of the bargains. The only one who endeavored to do so with a constant sense of duty was Mr. O'Brien, whose name has been already mentioned. But now the agreement for sale and purchase will be all that concerns the Commissioners; and yet they are to collect the instalments and transmit them to the Exchequer in operations for which there is pledged an Irish fund equivalent to a borrowing power of £200,000,000. To the fulfilment of the engagement the whole Irish nation is pledged, with the exception of the landlords who refused to delegate representatives to the Dunraven Conference; and these, if we mistake not, possess among them the greatest number of acres, if they are not the greatest number individually. A very significant incident is the prosecution of his suit against the United Irish League by Lord de Freyne after lying low during the months in which negotiations were going on between the representatives of the tenants and of the amenable landlords.

It is fair to state that an impression is said to prevail, one on which the policy of Land Purchase has been based by Lord Ashbourne, Mr. Balfour and the Chief Secretary, namely, that the ten-

[11] The writer of this article in 1883 was sent by the Land Commission to investigate the condition of the tenants on the estates of the London Companies in the County of Derry, in order—and to judge whether the applications for the benefit of the Arrears Act were *bona fide*, assuming he held that the legal questions of a preliminary kind on which his jurisdiction depended should be decided in their favor. Some difficult or special cases which had come before his predecessors in the county in sittings at the close of the year 1882 were the only ones not adjudged in favor of the tenants by these gentlemen out of several hundreds, and these were excepted only on legal points and not on the merits. They came before him for rehearing, and having decided the questions of law in the tenants' favor, there was no choice but to decide the questions of fact, which simply amounted to this—that the rents were excessive.

ants look to the immediate benefit from the completion of sale and not to the amount of money to be paid in instalments spread over a long term of years. The immediate benefit in all the schemes is that the annual instalment of the purchase money to be paid is less than the yearly rent. Considering this, critics in the leading magazines and on platforms expressed their wonder at such transactions being called purchases at all, instead of gifts made by the Government of the landlord's interest in each instance to the tenants. It would be idle to correct this notion, for the Exchequer expects to be paid principal and interest, the latter carefully calculated with regards to the credit of the State.

Assuming that an excessive price will have been paid for the landlord's interest in the holdings and that the Exchequer, quite regardless of this fact, professes confidence in the probity of the tenants and the value of the securities of all kinds on which the Chief Secretary relies, it is certainly reasonable to demand from the Government, on behalf of the Exchequer and the Irish and British taxpayers, such a system of administration as shall put the collection and transmission of the instalments of purchase on a sound basis. The Irish taxpayer is interested in this more directly and immediately than the British, as we have said; for he is pledged to the extent of the interest on £200,000,000, a sum of inestimable value in developing the industrial resources of the country as distinguished from the purely agricultural. We are not disparaging the Chief Secretary's great effort, we are not criticizing men who represented both landlord and tenants in a council of conciliation, but we insist that the success of the measure depends on the way it is worked, and it cannot be worked well by a board constituted like the one under the bill.

No doubt the measure would in any condition of affairs be administered by men specially appointed for the purpose, but the men should act in a department of State under the absolute control of an Irish government answerable to an Irish parliament. As the bill provides, the Commissioners shall be above all responsibility except to the Exchequer, and as long as the instalments are transmitted there will be no difficulty. But suppose the tenant-purchasers are unable to pay, what is to happen? We are not speaking of a strike against payment on the part of the tenant-purchasers; we are thinking of an honest inability to pay as the result of a bad season or a succession of bad seasons. In the bill of 1890-91 there was some elasticity, for time might be given for payment, but we search in vain for a discretionary power to grant time on the present measure. We do not say that such a power could be rightly bestowed on a mere board; we rather think it would be a mischievous and possibly

disastrous power in such hands; but such a power should be seated somewhere in the locality, and where, then, but in the executive of an Irish Parliament? This we think sufficiently clear.

There should be such a power, and in addition a power to make abatements, either temporary or permanent. Unless it be assumed that the Commissioners control the winds and the rains, and may send one of their officers to the storehouse of the snow with an injunction to restrain the officials there, there should be perfect elasticity of administration. As we said with regard to giving time, we say concerning the conferring of additional powers on a board in the present circumstances of Irish government and the utter ineffectiveness of Irish opinion, it would be mischievous or disastrous. It would lead to universal discontent and an agitation more furious than the Land League when Mr. Arthur Balfour described it as a "party violent in their designs to the verge of treason and unscrupulous in their methods beyond the limits of legality," and when he accuses them—in a passage hard to understand from a fair-minded man, but about which we shall say something—of looking on "social anarchy as the fitting prelude to Home Rule."

We do not exactly know if Mr. Balfour has changed this opinion, but undoubtedly only a few months ago a number of public men were in prison, and a respectable percentage of them was composed of members of Parliament. In addition to the powers of exceptional criminal statutes, one side in a purely trade quarrel exercised its undoubted right to institute civil proceedings. We pray our reader's attention to every line of this, as we have quoted the language of Mr. Balfour against the Land League[12] and the Home Rule movement. According to him there is no distinction between the two organizations, but his supporters in Ireland, the persons on whose representations he professed to rule the country, to advance whose interests financial, social and political war was made on three-fourths of the people, say there is a most marked distinction. They recognized the Home Rule movement as a perfectly legitimate but idle pursuit, an anachronism, a dream not unworthy of a sort of sympathetic pity, because of the unselfishness and idealism of its supporters, but about as practicable and useful as the restoration of the Heptarchy in England. Mr. Balfour himself at least impliedly drew a distinction between the Land League and the insurrectionary movements of 1848 and 1865 to the disadvantage of the

[12] The monstrous injustice of confounding a totally social movement, even though one of such immense consequences as that to change the ownership of a considerable part of the land of Ireland, with a purely political agitation like that to amend the legislative relations of the two countries, it would be hard to surpass.

former. He denounces the Land League as devoid of the high, self-sacrificing spirit of the '48 men and the men of '65, as animated by the basest and most sordid views, without scruple as to their means of reaching their ends of universal robbery and social triumph, and in stating such points of contrast he allowed it to be inferred that the young Irelanders and the Fenians were free from any guilt save that of treason, while the Land Leaguers and Home Rulers marched to objects lying on "the verge" of treason by every species of crime and outrage.

Yet to these men he surrendered in 1890-1 when he introduced a measure of Land Purchase and to the tenants who were the rank and file in that war of boycotting, of cattle maiming, of intimidation by every conceivable means, whether of social interdict or the midnight violence of armed and disguised bands making their rounds of terror from house to house of those who could not be relied upon to obey the decrees of the bog-side *vehmegericht*. What conclusion can be arrived at? Either Mr. Balfour in 1890-1 did not believe in the reality of the charges made by himself and others and investigated by what was called the Parnell Commission, or he himself and his party acted exactly as they had charged Mr. Gladstone with acting, that is, they surrendered to the forces of disorder and almost of treason, whose plan of action was to "make government in Ireland impossible" and render "social anarchy the fitting prelude to Home Rule."

What Mr. Balfour was as Irish Minister we find Mr. Wyndham to be, a man imprisoning the representatives of the people and large numbers of respectable men engaged in the furtherance of a trade agitation, and we must suppose both Ministers were doing all this through the purest motives. We are not disposed to enter into the controversy between Lord Penryhn and his miners, but we may draw some useful contrasts. These persons were the employer's servants or workmen and were paid wages for allotted work in the employer's mines, but the Irish tenants were joint owners with the landlord—this is the assertion which is the economic justification of Mr. Wyndham's bill—and were being deprived of their share of the joint property by the coöwner through a recourse to means perfectly legal. But who can say they were equitable under the circumstances? To take advantage of a bad harvest, say, or a disastrous fall in the price of black cattle or sheep that he might appropriate the share of his joint owner is hardly praiseworthy conduct on the part of the companion owner, and the owner acting thus not the one whom Paley[13] would deem the meritorious one. Now, the miners of Lord Penryhn were not batoned by the police, the leading men among them were not sentenced to terms of hard labor. We

want to know why did not Mr. Wyndham leave Lord de Freyne and the other landlords behind him—the trade union of landlords—to fight their battles in the four Courts or at the Assizes instead of sending large forces of police and military, battering rams and ambulances—in fact, all that paraphernalia of eviction which used to cost so much and the saving of the cost of which henceforth is a prophetic part of the basis for the £200,000,000 to secure "the British taxpayers" against liability on account of paying the landlords the price of villa residences and grounds for their shadowy interest in partially reclaimed morasses round wretched dwellings, or the patches of herbage and potatoes in the spaces between the rocks in the neighborhood of Swineford or between the boulders on the inaccessible heights of the Galtees.[14]

In Mr. Gladstone's measure of 1886 the Irish Parliament were made the controlling authority and were allowed a bonus for the collection and transmission of the installments. There was the security of the Irish nation competent to pledge its credit and in addition enjoying the very considerable financial interest of £450,000 a year to maintain it. Instead we have a board powerless for any good purpose put at the head of the landed interest of Ireland, put over the grants returned to Ireland from the Imperial Exchequer for such local interests as education and lunatic asylums and put over a security for £200,000,000, and all this because the Chief Secretary and the Government would seem to prefer the failure of the so-called policy of conciliation and the loss of £112,000,000 to success along the whole line coupled by a measure of Home Rule. We say the stars in their courses are fighting for the national idea. The ineptitude of the scheme for administering a measure so vast in the amount involved and so far-reaching in its consequences—a bill which more than any previous land act goes down to the foundation of social disorder and economic difficulty, and to a large extent to the sources of political and religious discontent—the ineptitude of the scheme, we say, is the very presage of defeat from causes in no way connected with the probity of Irish tenants or the good will of the other classes.

We shall conclude this article with the practical question: is it sound policy to make the Imperial Exchequer an universal Irish landlord in the event of the purchasers being prevented by any causes from fulfilling their engagements? The consideration is one

[13] We mean Pigeon Paley. We have been always impressed by the vividness of Paley's illustration, though, no doubt, small wits might laugh at it.

[14] An English "assurance" company used to draw £20,000 a year from the "shielings" (a hut of wattles roofed with sods) and a few acres of rock above the clouds. Another English assurance company squeezed an enormous rent roll from the desert of Partry in Mayo.

pregnant with eventualities one dare not contemplate. For the success of his measure in part the Chief Secretary has decided on the reduction of the police force hitherto maintained as the means to cope with what interested men pretended to regard as the sole elements of disorder. If, on the other hand, there should stand an authority in Ireland sustained by the whole power of public opinion and anxious for its own sake to safeguard the Exchequer, no one can fail to see how certain must be the fulfilment of every engagement entered into by the nation. In such a case the whole country, even the recalcitrant section of thte landlords included, would feel itself bound to preserve its credit at all costs and sacrifices; the whole country would then be the police. The future would depend upon the loyal correspondence of the native government with Imperial interests; the importance of winning the confidence of English capital would be a potent factor in the relations between both countries. Influences would be at work which no mere Board of Commissioners could command. Every effort would be strained by the Irish executive to compel dishonest purchasers to pay and every assistance would be given to enable honest ones, for whom circumstances had been too strong, to tide over their difficulties. A native legislature controlling such an executive alone could be the authority to bring about these results, and hence we say that this is the fulfilment of the policy begun by the scheme of Land Purchase.

George McDermot, C. S. P.

New York, N. Y.

THE "TWELFTH PROMISE."

SOME of our readers may perhaps have read the correspondence lately going on in the (London) *Tablet* occasioned by a short letter of the present writer on the subject of the Nine Fridays. It was not without a sense of weighty responsibility that the correspondence was begun, as it was only too clear that much of what would be said would occasion a devotional unsettlement in the minds of a few simple souls. Nor has this forecast proved false. Since the appearance of the letters to the *Tablet* I have been informed that A—— and B—— have given up devotion to the Sacred Heart. But in spite of the risk of an almost unavoidable "scandalum pusillorum," and in the only too keen realization of what it would mean

for souls whom it was hard to pain, I felt it a duty to make a protest merely in my own name and on my own responsibility against what I could only consider the abuse of the Twelfth Promise. The subject of the Twelfth Promise belongs to the liberty of the Sons of God; so that sides may be taken in the discussion without hurt to the conscience. Moreover, the speculative view of the history and theology of the Promise is not the only occasion of divergent opinions. Men may also part company in the view they hold of the means taken to popularize the promise. Some may think it both right and fit. Others may look upon it as unreal and—to use a theological word hard to put into English—"scandalosum." Some may hold that the present propaganda does nothing but good. Others, fully alive to the good done, may be no less alive to the mischief occasioned in the minds of the simpler members of the flock. And as those who think the propaganda of the promise to be right and fit are justified in giving vent to their views, so there can be no reason why those who have the full right to differ from them should not have the full right to publish the reasons for their difference. To say this—to say it strongly yet feelingly—to say it without sheltering oneself behind an anonymity—to say it in the full confidence that one has a right to say it—to say it under the painful feeling that to protest may be as great a duty as it is a right—to say it as prudently and as reverently as the difficulties of the subject will allow, may well be the one aim of a Catholic theologian in writing on the subject. Whilst such was his aim it would naturally be borne in upon him that certain souls would be inevitably pained, and even shocked at what he wrote. Yet he could not easily allow the responsibility of such pain to be laid at his own door. The greater part, if not the whole of such responsibility, he could only consistently lay to the door of those who were spreading or had spread the Twelfth Promise in such a way as to occasion a mistaken view of the grace of final perseverance. The blame, if any, he could only consistently attribute to those who had caused the wound, not to those who, like himself, did their best to cure it by first laying it bare.

These words of explanation, or, if you will, apology, need to be completed by an obvious remark. Discussion of the Twelfth Promise must not be mistaken for discouragement of the Nine Fridays. Writers in the *Tablet* again and again appeared anxious to defend the Nine Fridays by showing that the devotion did not lessen communions on Sundays and the greater feasts. Such a thesis will always be interesting; but it will always be a side issue. Moreover, it will be an issue which is probably as undemonstrable as it is accidental. How can it be proved or disproved? To whom

shall we appeal? Priests who encourage the devotion of the Nine Fridays can only consistently say that it does not interfere with Sunday and holy day communions; priests who discourage the devotion can only consistently say that it does. Shall we then appeal from opinions to statistics—from guess work to fact? By all means; if accurate statistics are to be found. But in matters like these where are such statistics to be found? Are not accurate numbers the hardest facts to come by? Memories are not always trustworthy, especially in regard to numbers, and more especially when men have a thesis to prove or disprove by their numbers. Shall we then appeal away from past numbers to future numbers? By all means; if the numbers are representative. But is it feasible to begin the keeping of statistics? Will not the intention defeat itself? No sooner is a proposal for keeping statistics mooted than a rise in Sunday communions will be the result. For these reasons, then, it will appear that the question of the influence of the Nine Fridays on Sunday and holy day communions must always practically remain a side issue, incapable of proof and disproof, and only akin to those general theses on which we practice our coming preachers or speakers in their debating clubs. So that to one who takes a broad philosophical view of evidence, if the question is put, "Do you hold that the Nine Friday devotion interferes with communion on Sundays and holy days?" the reply will be: "I do not know. Nor do I think that men will ever agree." No priest whose chief aim is to foster and safeguard his flock in the "liberty of the sons of God" will interfere with them if their bent leads them to make the First Fridays. He himself may wish to make the Fifteen Saturdays in honor of Our Lady. Doubtless he would look upon it as a hardship if his confessor meddled with this personal devotion. To be consistent, then, he must allow what he claims; "give and take" must be weighed in the same scales. He must not meddle with the personal bent of his penitent, unless indeed as the shepherd and doctor of souls he discovers that the strange fascination of numbers or a false view of the Twelfth Promise has misled them into material, if not formal, superstition. It will be seen that the only practical point of discussion is the Twelfth Promise. To confine a vast subject within natural bounds we shall deal with—I. The History of the Promise. II. The Propagation of the Promise. III. The Theology of the Promise.

THE HISTORY OF THE TWELFTH PROMISE.

Our readers may find it useful to have a chronological table:

1647. July 22, B. Margaret Mary born.

1674. First Revelation regarding the Sacred Heart.

1688. Letters to Mère de Saumaise regarding the Twelfth Promise.

1690. B. Margaret Mary dies.

1729. Bishop Languet's Life of Blessed Margaret Mary.

1864. Beatification of Blessed Margaret Mary.

1867. Text of Twelfth Promise first published.

1870. Propagation of Twelfth Promise begun.

It is not quite clear that we have the correct text of the Promise. Father Thurston gives the following: "One Friday during Holy Communion He said to His unworthy servant if she does not deceive herself, 'I promise thee in the excessive mercy of My Heart, that Its all-powerful love will grant to all those who communicate on nine consecutive First Fridays of the month the grace of final repentance; they shall not die in My disfavour nor without receiving their sacraments; for My divine Heart shall be their safe refuge in this last moment.'" (*Month*, June, 1903, p. 637.)

Father Thurston gives this version on the authority of Père Le Bachelet, S. J., *Études*, August 5, 1901. But whilst Père Le Bachelet, S. J., gives this text on the authority of the "Vie et Œuvres de la Bienhereuse Marguerite," etc., Paris, second edition, 1876, he adds what he calls the text itself (texte même), which differs in one striking particular from Father Thurston's text. In the foregoing text it is said that persons making the Nine Fridays "shall not die without receiving *their* sacraments;" but in this "texte même" of Père Le Bachelet it is said "without receiving *the* sacraments."

There is a third variant which we give on the authority of Bishop Languet. "She prescribed a practice for honoring the Heart of Jesus Christ which was familiar to her. Our Blessed Lord had suggested it to her, leading her to hope for the grace of final perseverance and of receiving *the sacraments of the Church before dying* for those who made use of the practice." (Vie de la Venerable Mere M. M., Paris, 1830, II. e. part, p. 23.) Then follows mention of the Nine Fridays. It will be seen that this variant agrees with the second text in saying "*the* sacraments," whereas the first text says "*their* sacraments." Moreover, Bishop Languet simply says that Our Lord suggested the practice of the Nine Fridays "en lui faisant espéres," *i. e.*, "in leading her to hope" for final perseverance. Those who are acquainted with the lives of mystical saints know how commonly these holy souls receive heavenly counsels in the choice of devotions for a happy death. To some of us it will doubtless appear that the revelation granted to Blessed Margaret Mary, if authentic, was of this nature. Strangely enough, this view of the Promise is borne out by three facts: 1. In Father Thurston's words, "Blessed Margaret Mary herself does not appear to have

attached any exceptional significance or importance" to the Promise. (*The Month*, June, 1903, p. 637.) 2. Bishop Lanquet speaks of a "practice which was *familiar to her*." It is strange that this practice, at once so familiar to the saint and stimulated by such an "astonishing and precious promise" should be mentioned in only one letter, some two years before her death. 3. Moreover, it is remarkable that Blessed Margaret died without receiving the Last Sacraments.

The history of the letter to Mère de Saumaise which contains the promise is interesting to historical specialists. The various points likely to take their notice may be summarized from Father Thurston's admirable paper in *The Month*.

1. "The autograph text of the letter . . to Mère de Saumaise . . . (is) now no longer in existence."

2. There are "three early copies of the letter. . . . One is certainly older than 1714. A second is most probably older still, while a third is more ancient than either of the others."

3. "With regard to the few words of the promise which alone concern us here the differences of reading are of the most trivial nature."

4. "In an article which appeared last year in the *Études* Père Hamon called attention to the extraordinary license which all the saint's contemporaries permitted themselves in editing whatever proceeded from her pen. . . . Those who prepared her letters for the public eye considered themselves justified in taking every kind of liberty with regard to the phraseology, . . . and so expressions were altered and toned down or occasionally omitted, until it is sometimes hardly possible to recognize the phraseology of the Blessed Margaret Mary at all. . . . When one realizes the complete absence of literary conscience which such a process implies one is tempted at the first blush to think that with editors who so little respected the text they were dealing with, almost any perversion was possible." (Perhaps on the death of Blessed Margaret Mary without the last sacraments, this "absence of literary conscience" will account for the fact that some texts read "without *the* sacraments," whilst others read "without *their* sacraments.")

A last stage in the history of the Promise was reached when her cause of beatification was introduced. In 1843 the Great Promise was formally objected to by the Advocatus Diaboli. The following facts, taken from Father Thurston's article in the *Month* will serve to give readers an outline of the matter.

1. "The reply of Mgr. Arnaldi, the Postulator Causæ is to the effect that all such promises are understood to be based upon the implied condition that God's law is kept. They amount to no more than an assurance of special graces" (p. 638).

2. "Mgr. Arnaldi is careful to include the introductory qualification, 'He said to His unworthy servant, if she does not deceive herself,' which had been omitted in his opponent's objection" (p. 639.)

3. There is no mention of the Twelfth Promise in the Bull of Beatification. It has been urged that there is no mention of the Rosary in the Bull of Canonization of St. Dominic. The cases are not parallel. Because no one, to my knowledge, has ever held that the question of the Rosary was discussed previous to canonization; the Twelfth Promise was discussed, and there is a strong Papal tradition in favor of the Rosary; there is no Papal tradition in favor of the Twelfth Promise.

4. It has been argued that the qualification "if I do not deceive myself" means nothing in the mouth of Blessed Margaret Mary, because Mère de Greyfie had wished her to add it when speaking of her extraordinary graces. But to some of us it would seem unlikely that a saint could feign uncertainty when she was quite certain of a fact—especially in the case of a Promise which is reputed so "astounding and precious." Father Thurston writes: "It must be remarked that we do not invariably find this note of doubt in the saint's descriptions of her supernatural experiences, especially when we are dealing with her own autographs" (p. 637). When the Advocatus Diaboli omitted this phrase the Postulator Causæ took care to put it in.

We may summarize the history of the Twelfth Promise as follows: It is recorded that Our Blessed Lord made a promise—a "precious and astonishing promise"—to Blessed Margaret Mary, "to which she does not appear to have attached any exceptional significance or importance;" which she prefaces with the phrase "if I do not deceive myself;" of which the autograph is lost; of which three copies remain, all differing in certain ("trivial:" Thurston) phrases, in company with other letters, etc., so handled as to be almost beyond recognition, and that the first reference to the Nine Fridays is in Bishop Languet's book some forty years after the promise; that this reference does not coincide with the promise as commonly propagated; that the promise was submitted to Rome before the saint's beatification; that the Postulator Causæ took it to mean no more than an assurance of special graces; that he took care to add the distinctive formulary "if I do not deceive myself," which is not always found in the account of her revelations, especially in her autographs; that the Bull of her beatification contains no mention of this revealed promise, though it contains a reference to her other visions—which were equally examined—and that the fact of her having said that she received this promise "if I do not deceive myself" was no bar to her beatification.

THE PROPAGATION OF THE TWELFTH PROMISE.

A few preliminary remarks may be set down: "Considered in itself Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus is independent of the promises made to the Blessed Margaret Mary. This is a truth which it would be useless to prove." (Le Bachelet, S. J. *Ètudes*; reprinted in "*Le Messager du Coeur de Jèsus*," Toulouse, Oct., 1902, p. 608).

"Most of the vogue which attaches in the popular mind to the First Friday Communion is due to the famous promise believed to have been made by Our Lord to Blessed Margaret Mary in 1688. (Father Thurston, p. 636.)

The Twelfth Promise "is treated by some with a kind of avoidance or of vague mistrust." (Le Bachelet, p. 608.)

We may now go on to give an account of the Propagation of the Promise.

1. "The text of the Blessed Margaret Mary's letter" (*i. e.*, the Twelfth Promise) "was first printed in 1867." (Thurston, p. 636.)

2. In the older Manuals of the Sacred Heart we find eleven promises in the concise form and in the same order they have still kept. For a long time in the majority of leaflets no other promises were printed.* It was not until 1870, when devotion to the Sacred Heart received such a new stimulus in France that a twelfth was added" (Le Bachelet, p. 610). "Since then the most extraordinary development has taken place in the First Friday Communions (Thurston, p. 636). Père le Bachelet reminds us of the outburst of devotion to the Sacred Heart in France caused by the Franco-Prussian war in 1870. Such a period of national stress is likely to give rise to new fervor not merely in devotional practices but even in devotional excesses. During the great schism in the fifteenth century it is painful to contrast the quiet reformation wrought by the Brethren of the Common Life with the destruction wrought by the errors of Wyclif and the false prophecies of Telesophorus. The noble enthusiasm which began the Basilica of Montmartre in the day

* There are *fourteen* promises set down in a little book entitled "Promises Made by Our Lord Jesus Christ to Blessed Margaret Mary," translated from the French, Montreuil-sur-Mer, 1894. I quote the last three promises (capitals as in original):

"XII. THOSE WHO SHALL BE DEVOTED AND CONSECRATED TO THIS DIVINE HEART SHALL NEVER PERISH.

"XIII. THOSE WHO RECEIVE COMMUNION ON THE FIRST FRIDAY OF NINE CONSECUTIVE MONTHS SHALL HAVE A HAPPY DEATH.

"XIV. THE SACRED HEART OF JESUS SHALL REIGN."

A correspondent, under the anonym R. L. I. N., writing in the *Tablet*, June 27, 1903, says that the book is "written by Father de Franciosi, S. J. . . . The work is a learned treatise on devotion to the Sacred Heart and has the imprimatur of the Provincial."

of France's humiliation was not necessarily exempt from the universal law of corruption which overshadows the best instincts and perverts the purest devotions.

3. The propagation of the Twelfth Promise is carried on by every literary means from the unauthorized pious picture to the "learned treatise." A picture of this sort, most artistically printed by Bouasse Lebel, Paris, was the occasion of the present writer taking the matter in hand. It contained the Twelve Promises—the twelfth in the following form: "To those who communicate (sic) the First Friday of the month for nine consecutive months I promise the grace of final repentance; they shall not die in My disfavour, nor without receiving *the sacraments*, and My Heart shall be their refuge at that last hour." I called this promise "scandalous." I did not say untrue, because the truth preached untimely may scandalize the weaker brethren. In a further letter I explained that I attached the note of "scandalous" not to the promise in itself, as it was supposed to come from Our Blessed Lord, but as sometimes propagated.

Another form of this propagation is exemplified in "The Little Treasury of Leaflets," M. & S. Eaton, Dublin. "I promise thee in the excess of the mercy of My Heart that its all-powerful love will grant to all those who receive Communion on the First Friday of every month for nine consecutive months, *the grace of final repentance* and that they shall *not dlo under My displeasure* nor without receiving the sacraments, and My Heart shall be their secure refuge at that last hour.

"This last astonishing and precious promise is found twice in 'The Life of the Blessed Margaret Mary,' written by her contemporaries and transcribed by them from her own autograph letters.

"It must be remembered, however, that the Communion must be offered on the First Friday. The following will not suffice for it. Moreover, if this novena be, for any reason, interrupted we must begin it again.

"Tell this to your neighbor, or send for more copies of these papers and spread them." (Vol. I., No. 35.)

Not all the pious pictures contain the Twelfth Promise. I have a most artistic picture by Blanchard of Orleans with only eleven promises, the Twelfth being omitted.

The little book, "the learned treatise," as the writer in the *Tablet* calls it, of Father de Franciosi, S. J., has been mentioned before. As the author gives *fourteen* promises the Twelfth Promise becomes the thirteenth: "Those who receive Communion on the First Friday of nine consecutive months shall have a happy death. . . . These expressions are very clear. . . . The real text has been

laid aside for want of space. . . . Moreover, even where her own words have been kept, they are reduced to the shortest extracts from her writings, and these cannot fail to lose much by being isolated from their context. . . . N. B.—The words *it seems to me, if I mistake not*, and other such expressions often made use of by Blessed Margaret Mary in quoting the words of Our Divine Lord, are the fruit of her humility and in no way imply a doubt on her part as to the reality or the nature of the communication with which she was favoured." (Ut supra, pp. 7-9.)

A more exhaustive account must be given of a pamphlet printed at St. Joseph's College Press, Trichinopoly, 1898, with the imprimatur of Joannes Maria, S. J., Bishop of Trichinopoly. It begins as follows: "With the kind permission of the Rev. Father J. Wynne, S. J., editor of the *American Messenger of the Sacred Heart*, the following pages on the Twelfth Promise are reprinted from its February number, 1898.

"It is our opinion, shared by men whom we look upon as good judges in the matter, that of all the explanations we have read till now this is by far the most exhaustive. . . . Though its author modestly proposes it only as highly probable, it seems to us it entirely justifies the hope generally entertained by persons who perform the devotion of the Nine First Fridays."

In the book itself the writer in the *American Messenger* gives the usual form of the Promise, making use of the phrase "leues sacraments" (their sacraments) not "les sacraments" (*the* sacraments). Some passages may be culled from it.

I. "It is not our intention to treat of the authenticity of this Promise. We may say, however, that it would be very risky to call its authenticity in question, since it is found in the writings of Blessed Margaret Mary, which have passed the scrutiny of the Roman Congregation" (p. 9).

Compare this with Father Thurston, who says that even after the examination and beatification, "None the less, the question of the authenticity of the revelation is left untouched" (p. 639). Also Benedict XIV.: "It follows then that any one may without injury to the Catholic faith give no heed to these revelations and differ from them." (De Beat. and Canon., London, Eng., Trans., Vol. III., p. 397.)

II. The writer gives three explanations of the Promise. The first is that of the famous Père Ramiere: "That in it we have only a guarantee of more than ordinary help at the hour of death" (p. 10). (This would also seem the meaning put upon it by the Postulator Causæ, when forwarding the cause of beatification.) "Our Lord . . . promises extra help, not salvation. He holds out the cer-

tainty of extraordinary favours at the hour of death. He gives no certainty of final repentance" (p. 11). *This opinion is rejected.*

The second opinion is that of "a learned writer in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, Nov., 1890. . . . This Promise stands on a level with many other promises which we frequently meet in Sacred Writ. 'Alms delivereth from death' (Job xii., 9). 'He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood shall have everlasting life' (St. John vi., 55). . . . It does not give certainty of salvation. . . . It seems to us the second explanation does not differ substantially from the first" (pp. 12, 13). *This opinion is likewise rejected.*

The third opinion is that of the writer himself, which we shall give in his own words.

III. "The third explanation insists on taking the words of the great Promise in their plain and obvious sense (p. 13). The grace of a good death is held out absolutely to all who worthily perform the Devotion of the Nine Fridays.

"If any of those who have performed this Devotion fall into mortal sin they shall receive the efficacious grace of repentance before death.

'If they do not receive the efficacious grace of *perfect contrition* they may be sure of receiving whatever sacrament is necessary for their reconciliation."

These great blessings, however, are not held out as the reward of any merit acquired by fulfilling the conditions of the Promise. Neither do they seem to be offered as the infallible object of this Devotion in so far as it is a prayer.

"The blessings of which there is question are granted as a pure gift of the Sacred Heart. The Nine Communions are but the condition under which this gift is offered" (pp. 29, 30).

IV. He then goes on to put an obvious objection founded on Our Blessed Lord's promise. The words of the writer are as follows:

Objection. "But is not the Promise made to Blessed Margaret Mary to be interpreted after the same manner as the Promise in John vi., 52, 'If any one eat of this bread, he shall live forever?' "

Reply. ". . . the Great Promise does insure to him an *efficacious* grace wherewith he shall *unfailingly*, though with full liberty, perform whatever may be necessary for salvation" (p. 26). "Does not the grace of 'final repentance' imply that we shall have, to some extent at least, nullified the effect of those Communions by our sins? And still that grace is promised. Nor will it suffice to say that this grace is only a *sufficient* one—very special, no doubt—very powerful—but still only sufficient. For not only is it a grace coming from the excess of Christ's mercy, but is a grace of such a kind that none of those who receive it 'shall die in Christ's disfavor.'

"We are not to restrict the Promise made to Blessed Margaret Mary in the same way as we are obliged both by Scripture and Tradition to restrict the Promise made in the Gospel of St. John, for the two promises are not parallel. In the Gospel the promise is general; our Lord does not prescribe when or how often the Sacrament of His Body is to be received. In the Great Promise He lays down the exact number of times and the exact days on which we are to receive Him. Is it not likely that He also lays down the exact result?" (Pp, 27, 28.) A well-known and highly respected ecclesiastic who sends me this book calls it "incredibly unreal."

A Canon Diocesan Inspector sends me a leaflet with the words, "You may be glad to add the enclosed to your collection of unauthorized promises." The leaflet is entitled "The Twentieth Century and the Sacred Heart." At the head of the page, in red letters, are written the words, "I will grant the grace of final penitence to those who receive Holy Communion on the First Fridays of nine consecutive months." In the body of the pamphlet are the words, "There is a homage which a great number of the faithful could easily render to Our Lord, a homage He has claimed as being very agreeable to His Heart and one He has consecrated and encouraged by the promise of eternal salvation. It is Communion on the First Friday of nine consecutive months.

"Holy Church has adopted and blessed this practice." The writer's name is Stephen Coubé, S. J. There is no imprimatur.

To sum up: I have received private letters enough from Provosts, Monsignors, Deans, Diocesan Inspectors and Parish Priests to show that there is a widespread dislike of the method of propagating the Twelfth Promise. Nor can we be surprised if the simple faithful on reading the books I have summarized above are led into material, I will not say formal, superstition. It was for this reason that I have all along used the formal word scandalous. That scandal has been given by these books—these popular books, not erudite theological treatises—the private letters I have received from England, Ireland, Belgium and America sufficiently prove. Only a few days ago I received the following from a convert priest, who received his theological training in Rome:

"Will you allow me to say that I am very grateful to you for having opened the question of the Nine First Fridays? In my mission I encourage the First Friday Communion and have told the faithful of the Plenary Indulgence granted to those who, on those days, after Confession and Communion meditate for a while on the infinite goodness of the Sacred Heart; but two curious facts have come under my notice: 1. A young girl in my mission who would not miss a First Friday Communion for anything did not go to Holy

Communion on the Feast of Pentecost or on the Feast of the Sacred Heart, and (b) my housekeeper gravely informed me that she was quite certain she should have the Last Sacraments at her death, because she had made the Nine Fridays."

THE THEOLOGY OF THE TWELFTH PROMISE.

Under this heading there are many points to be examined bristling with difficulty. We shall treat of two (a) What can be said of the Promise itself? and (b) What can be said of the examination of the Promise made before the beatification of the saint?

(a). The Council of Trent says: "Si quis magnum illud usque in finem perseverantiæ donum se certo habiturum absoluta certitudine dixerit; nisi hoc ex speciali revelatione dixerit anathema sit." (Sess. Vi., Can. XVI. de Justif.")

There would seem no doubt that Almighty God could promise final perseverance as a reward for the Nine First Fridays, though it is often useless and not seldom irreverent to question the possibilities of Omnipotence. However, the "Promissiones Christi," for which the Church so often prays to be made worthy, are part of the great Deposit of Faith, treasured up in Scripture and Tradition. To those great Promises the course of ages brings no new Promise. To say, as a writer quoted above says, that the Twelfth Promise "goes further" than the solemn Promise in St. John's Gospel gives great perplexity to those of us who shrink from strong but justifiable protest. Speaking only for myself I say that such a phrase is "scandalous," *i. e.*, calculated to lead simple souls into material superstition.

The Theology of the Twelfth Promise is certainly, perhaps unavoidably, complicated by the so-called Sabbatine Indulgence of the Brown Scapular. But we may remark that just as theologians have been warm in defending this Indulgence, so have other theologians been equally earnest in attacking it. If Benedict XIV. is on the side of its authenticity, Papebrock and Lauroy are against its authenticity. Perhaps it may one day be condemned as spurious. For myself I hold no side. But I would venture to suggest that there is no complete parallel between the Sabbatine Indulgence and the Twelfth Promise. In the former case final perseverance is granted to one who wears a scapular, *i. e.*, who makes an act of faith, until death; in the latter case final perseverance is granted to one who may have performed an exercise fifty years before death and may have lived meanwhile in mortal sin. The Sabbatine Indulgence has something to go upon in the present act of faith; the Twelfth Promise has nothing to go upon in the past act of faith. Even if the Sabbatine Indulgence were admitted as theologically

possible, the Twelfth Promise would not necessarily be admitted as possible. The onus of proving the parity between them would lie upon the patrons of the Twelfth promise, and not upon its questioners. Nor will the words "final repentance" allow them to employ a common means of defense. When the Twelfth Promise is defended stress is laid on the Nine Fridays; when the Promise has to be defended stress is laid on a "Good Life."

With regard to visions dealing with an assurance of predestination or reprobation, St. Francis of Sales declares that they are specially open to suspicion (Œuvres, Vol. XIII., Edit. 1831. Lettres Bk. II., Ep. 23). Amort, so prized by St. Alphonsus and Benedict XIV., bluntly writes: "Revelationes autem omnes in quibus certa opera peragentibus, vel certa scapularia gestantibus vel certas orationes recitantibus promittitur conversio in articulo mortis, sunt somnia mulibria ex illusione dacamonum, and prohibentur a sacra Congr. Indicis. prout pates ex Indice Romae Edit o 1753." ("Ethica Christiana," 1758, p. 270. Though Father Thurston cannot find this decision of the Index.

If ever the question of the Sabbatine Indulgence and the Twelfth Promise is decided on purely theological grounds, it may not be hazardous to forecast that the decision will follow from two principles of St. Thomas, one regarding the Deposit of Faith, the other regarding the Grace of Final Perseverance. In the 2a. 2ae., 174, 6 3m. he lays down the principle that private revelations can add nothing to Revelation. In the 1a. 2ae., 112, 9 he lays down the principle that the grace of final perseverance cannot be merited. For the moment all theologians of note are agreed that the free-will of man cannot merit this grace "de condigno," though some are inclined to think that it can merit the grace "de congruo."

(b). What can be said of the examination of the Promise which was made previous to the saint's beatification?

1. Beatification is, roughly speaking, a declaration of the heroicity of a saint's virtues, *i. e.*, Faith, Hope, Charity and the Four Cardinal Virtues. It is evident that even the heroic virtue of the greatest saints is compatible with venial imperfections. It is especially evident that heroic faith may be quite compatible with certain unwitting errors with regard to the doctrines of faith, still more with regard to private revelations or supernatural manifestations. In these matters of faith the Church asks chiefly if the subject for beatification or canonization has been obstinate in holding his own opinions, or if he has been willing to submit them to the decision of the Church. The best may blunder. It is not error but headstrongness that makes the heretic. If the writings of the candidate for canonization contain innocent mistakes this would be no permanent

bar to his canonization. It would be very difficult to reconcile all the writings of all canonized saints. In the case of Blessed Margaret Mary the Promoter of the Cause seems to have felt the importance of this. We are told that the "Advocatus Diaboli" omitted the restrictive phrase "if I do not deceive myself," and that the Postulator took care to make good the omission. In the case of a private revelation like that of Blessed Margaret Mary, the examination proves that there was no bar to beatification in her (conditional) way of holding the revelation. It cannot be made to prove that the revelation itself was authentic.

2. Some few extracts from Benedict XIV. ("De Beat. and Canon." SS. English Tr. London, 1852, Vol III.) may be found useful. "What is to be said of those private revelations which the Apostolic See has approved of, those of the Blessed Hildegard, of St. Bridget and of St. Catharine of Siena? We have already said that those revelations, although approved, ought not to, and cannot, receive from us any assent of Catholic, but only of human, faith, according to the rules of prudence, according to which the aforesaid revelations are probable and piously to be believed" (p. 395).

". . . It follows, then, that any one may without injury to the Catholic faith give no heed to these revelations and differ from them" (p. 397).

"When some years ago they were discussing at Rome the resumption of the cause, Tirasone, that is, that of the beatification and canonization of the venerable servant of God Sister Mary a Jesu de agreda and her revelations were to be examined, the theologians of the seraphic religion and the Postulator of the Cause published a book at the Papal press in 1730 in which we read: 'Theologians and mystics acknowledge that private revelations, however approved and received, although they ought to be believed by those to whom they are given, among others the oppposite' (speaking of the opinions which are adverse to those revelations) 'retain the same probability which they had before the revelation.'

"Hurtado after reciting the approbation of the revelations of St. Bridget by the Sovereign Pontiffs, speaks as follows: 'It is not the meaning of these Supreme Pontiffs that we may not dissen from these revelations' (397, 398).

"The sixth question is, whether a saint may have revelations, not from the Holy Spirit, but resulting from his own individual judgment and reasonings, so far as his intellect, influenced by pious dispositions and imbued with opinions on any subject connected with religion, judge that he has the divine spirit. When, however, he is in invincible error." . . . (Reply) "It may happen that a saint may think from pre-conceived opinions and from fixed ideas

in the imagination that certain things are revealed to him by God, which yet God does not reveal" (402, 403).

I shall add a few words to sum up this third division of my paper and with it the whole of what I have written. To use a phrase of Father Thurston's, the beatification of the saint leaves the question of the authenticity of the Promise "untouched." The question of the theological possibility of such a promise is equally untouched. It may be decided in years to come that such a promise is spurious because impossible. That form of the Promise which includes the reception of *the* last sacraments is evidently impossible in its literal interpretation, seeing that numbers have died after the Nine Fridays without the sacraments, of whom the first was Blessed Margaret Mary herself. Were I to make a personal confession I should say that to my unhistorical mind it seems historically more probable that a revelation was made to the saint, though I do not pretend to think the evidence faultless or complete. But it seems to me that the promise is no more than has been made to many other saints. It is another form of publishing God's mercifulness of heart. It is but a repetition of the "Promissiones Christi" enshrined in Scripture and Tradition. It cannot go "further" than the Gospel Promise. To lay great stress upon it, to make it the great motive for First Friday Communions, to publish it without note or comment, to summarize it by promising a "Happy Death," to dwell upon the authenticity of it, to take views of it which are not sanctioned by the explanation of the Postulator Causæ, to make little of the saint's humble and wise formula, "If I do not deceive myself," to seem to accept it in its literal form, and in this guise to spread it abroad everywhere by book and pamphlet and tract and pious picture, is in my poor humble opinion to give occasion to material superstition.

VINCENT MCNABB, O. P.

Woodchester, Gloucester, England,

A FATAL ERROR IN EDUCATION AND ITS REMEDY.

THE question of religious instruction in the public schools, which has been agitated in this country for more than fifty years, seems to have engaged the attention of educators particularly during the past year. The most animated and most interesting discussion of the last meeting of the National Educational Association held at Boston, July, 1903, was that on religious

instruction in the public schools. A few months previous, at a great convention of educators and clergymen at Chicago, a National Organization for the Improvement of Religious Education was founded. The plan of this organization had been proposed in the *Biblical World*, November, 1902. A leading article of this review, said to be inspired by its editor, President Harper, of the University of Chicago, declares that "it has become increasingly clear that the instruction of the young in religion and morality, which is given in the Sunday school, the home and by other means, is inadequate to the present need. . . . For the past twenty-five years there has been a growing recognition of the unsatisfactoriness of the existing conditions." This is one of the many recent utterances of non-Catholics who begin to admit the constant claim of Catholics, namely, that a system of schools which fails to teach religion is defective, nay, dangerous to the welfare of society and the State. They concede, explicitly or implicitly, that the exclusion of religious teaching from the public schools is one of the greatest blunders that have been made in this country. Catholics have all along objected to a system of education which excludes all religious teaching; for decades they have been assailed for their conscientious attitude in this momentous question and have even been charged with hostility to the republic. At last this outrageous calumny is repudiated even by Protestants. To quote one instance among many, Professor Coe, of the Northwestern University, said in January of this year in a lecture delivered in Chicago: "The position of Roman Catholics in regard to religion and education and their policy in the establishment of parochial schools are absolutely correct." The number of those Protestants who advocate the introduction of some sort of religious teaching in the schools is increasing every day. However, many non-Catholic educators still proclaim that it is either unnecessary, or unadvisable, or even impossible to teach religion in the public schools. Thus at the recent convention of the National Educational Association no less a man than the United States Commissioner of Education, Dr. Harris, declared that religious instruction should be confined to the church and that it should be divorced entirely from the public schools.[1] It is true, many members of the convention remonstrated vigorously against this view, but not a few defended it with equal vigor. Mr. J. M. Greenwood, Superintendent of Schools, Kansas City, stated: "As the separation of State and Church is a fundamental principle of our government, Church and school should be kept always separate."

The defenders of this view hold that religious instruction, neces-

[1] *Boston Evening Transcript*, July 7, 1903.

sary as it is, can sufficiently be imparted in the family and by the Church in the Sunday school. Indeed, the *family* is a powerful factor in the religious education of the young—provided the family life is truly religious. But what is the actual state of affairs? Thousands of families are pervaded by a spirit of utter religious indifference, and the consequence is that tens of thousands of children hear absolutely nothing about religion at home and learn not even a short prayer in the family circle. Should not the school, the most highly organized, and consequently most powerful, educational institution make up for this deficiency as well as for deficiency in other instruction? For why are children sent to school at all? If all parents were able and willing to impart all necessary information to their children, there would be no need of schools. But schools are necessary because parents do not give, and in most cases cannot give, that secular instruction which is requisite for the welfare of the children and the community. Should not the school supply that instruction which is far more necessary for the individual and society and which is actually not given in the home, namely, religious instruction?

However, the objection is raised that it is the duty of the Church to teach religion. In very truth it is. But in order to fulfil this sacred duty the Church must have that influence on the education of the young which is hers by human and divine right. She should not be excluded from the school; she should have a share in the school hours to teach the children of her denomination the truths of religion, as is done in the schools of Germany, Holland and other European countries, and as is being done at last in England. But how and where is the Church to fulfil her duty when, as in this country, all influence on the public school system is jealously warded off? We are told: in the *Sunday school.* This is the solution of the great and important problem offered by many people in this country. The experiment has been tried for years, but with what success? Let us listen to Protestant authorities. A few years ago the *Congregationalist,* one of the ablest Protestant papers in the country, observed: "The contrast between the work done by the Roman Catholics for the children of this country and that done by the much larger body of Protestants ought to set us thinking whether our Sunday schools meet the need of the children for training in the knowledge of God and of their duty to Him." The *Biblical World* has of late frequently emphasized the insufficiency of the Sunday school to impart a thorough religious and moral training. Thus we read: "Is this primary mission [of teaching religion and morals] being adequately performed through the Sunday school and the home? It has been so assumed, but each passing year shows more

clearly that this is not the case. Further, there is a growing judgment of Christian people that adequate instruction in religion and morality cannot be given in the Sunday school and home alone. The home no longer feels the necessary responsibility, and the Sunday school has neither the time nor the instrumentalities for adequate instruction. . . . Since only a limited number of children attend Sunday school, or live in homes where real religion and morality are found, it has resulted that the *great majority* of children have been growing up without essential religious and ethical education."[2] This is the reason why the Sunday school is unable to impart efficient religious and moral training: relatively few attend Sunday school, and, even if all attended, the time allotted is totally inadequate. We may still add another consideration. Will children sufficiently respect and cherish a "branch of study" which is excluded from the regular curriculum and for which any spare time is good enough? Further, is it the proper condition if twenty to thirty hours are weekly devoted to the teaching of spelling, arithmetic, and the like, and one hour to the teaching of the "one thing necessary," religion and morality? Well has the Right Reverend Bishop of Trenton said: "We shall be told: Teach religion in your churches. No one, I presume, will accuse Catholics of neglect in this matter, and yet we are satisfied that such teaching alone is insufficient."[3]

In the present paper we are not concerned with those who wish all religious teaching to be relegated to the home and the church, but rather with those who advocate some kind or other of religious instruction in the schools. The great difficulty which confronts these educators is the method to be adopted and the extent to which religion may be taught in schools frequented by children of various denominations. Here many Protestants commit a serious error in advocating a system which is both inefficient and harmful. They want religion to be taught, but this teaching must be "unsectarian, undenominational," one that will suit every one and offend none. Thus Mr. Brooks, of Texas, in the recent convention of the National Educational Association, argued for a religious training in the schools "which should be satisfactory and common to all denominations."[4] Other members of the convention advanced similar views. The proposition is in no way a new one; it has been ventilated in this country for more than fifty years in nearly every meeting of educators that entered upon the question of religious training of youth. At times the scheme is presented in different garb, under

2 *Biblical World*, October, 1902.
3 *North American Review*, September, 1900.
4 *Boston Evening Transcript*, July 7, 1903.

other names, but in reality it is always the same. As an instance we may quote President Jesse, of the Missouri State University, who told the pupils of the Central High School of Kansas City in 1901 that religion should be taught in all the public schools, from the ward schools to the high schools; however, he would not have any sectarianism, but "the basis of Christian teaching as an object of study."[5] We might as well expect protection against a blizzard from the "basis" of a house. No, the complete edifice is needed to afford protection. The study of the "basis" of Christian teaching will never safeguard youth in the storms of life. The complete system of Christian doctrine must be taught and inculcated in the youthful minds. Attempts at teaching unsectarian, undenominational religion have been justly ridiculed by earnest Protestants. Lord Salisbury, the English statesman, said of it: "Numbers of persons have invented what I may call a patent, compressible religion which can be forced into all consciences with a little squeezing; and they wish to insist that this should be the only religion taught throughout the schools of the nation."[6]

In the recent animated controversy on religious teaching in England, Mr. Storey, a Nonconformist, observed: "Neither the State nor the Churches themselves can invent an undenominational Christianity. It seems to have been imagined by certain people that the Christian religion is of the nature of a fancy cake, uniform and homogeneous at the bottom, but blossoming into distinct denominational bonbons at the top; and that while some persons might prefer the green sugarplum, and others the red, all alike would be willing to partake of the lower portions. It is an illusory and misleading metaphor. The religious difference between the Anglican and the Nonconformist is not a difference that emerges only in advanced elaborations of doctrine; it starts in the roots and the rudiments. There is no 'average' Christianity, but three or four generic interpretations differing more or less from one another, and differing to that extent throughout."[7]

Indeed, this unsectarian teaching of religion fully deserves the unsparing criticism and ridicule with which it has been branded by many writers. It is based on the false assumption that all religions are equally true, or that the different tenets held by all religious sects can be reduced to a common denominator of truth, or separated like skimmed milk from the cream so as to leave an unsectarian residuum of religion to which none of the numerous sects can object. Such a theory is a stupendous delusion and imposture. What could

---

[5] The St. Louis *Globe-Democrat*, May 18, 1901.
[6] *Fortnightly Review*, May, 1896.
[7] London *Tablet*, July 19, 1902.

be left if this theory were carried out consistently? There is not a single truth of Divine revelation, not even the Divinity of Christ and His redemption, which is not denied by one or the other sect.[8] To state it briefly: there is no undenominational religion, and that colorless and "boiled down" religion which would be the result of unsectarian teaching is neither Christianity nor any other religion whatsoever. It is as contemptible to the infidel as it is objectionable to the earnest believer. Above all, it will never produce the salutary results expected from religious teaching for strengthening the morality of the young. It has no more educational value than that "æsthetic" or "humanitarian" religion which abounds in lofty sentiment, but lacks the sure foundation of dogma. We may well quote in this connection the words of Dr. McCosh, of Princeton: "There are fathers shuddering at the thought of bringing up their sons to such a creed, or, rather, negation of creed: they have fears that its gossamer threads will not restrain the youth when flesh and blood are strong and temptations are in the way. Mothers are not sure that the faith expounded will stay and support their daughters and keep them from rushing into and running round the giddy whirls of pleasure, in which they are certain to become dizzy and fall."[9]

Catholics will never consent to any such mutilated system of religious instruction. They have special reasons for suspecting the "unsectarian" teaching of religion. Many years ago the Anglican Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Whateley, wrote in a private letter: "The education given by the National Board is gradually undermining the vast fabric of the Irish Roman Catholic Church. *If we give up mixed education we give up the only hope of weaning the Irish from Popery.*"[10] Truly weighty words, worthy of being remembered by Catholics in every land who have to fight for the Catholic education of their children. It will also be easy to understand why a Roman Congregation told Catholics a few years ago that "it would be much safer in mixed schools to have only secular subjects of instruction taught than that the articles of faith common to all should be given in a maimed form." As matters are, the Catholics will be the first and heaviest losers; but, let it be understood, the Protestants will gain little. Such education will indeed wean the children from Popery, but it will not make sincere Protestants of them. They will turn infidels or swell the crowd of the religiously indifferent. Hence we cannot help designating this scheme of

---

[8] See the letters of the Right Rev. Bishop of Salford in the *Tablet*, October 25 and November 1, 1902.

[9] "Christianity and Positivism." Lecture VI., "Rationalism in America; Boston Theology."

[10] The *Month* (London), November, 1897.

"religious" instruction as a dangerous and pernicious experiment; it is nothing but "casting out devils by Beelzebub."

We now come to a solution of the religious problem which has always figured conspicuously in educational and religious discussions in this country, but which has never been debated as keenly as within the last few years, and we may say within the last months. Thus the *Biblical World* (October and November, 1902), after having deplored the serious losses which have resulted from the total exclusion of religious teaching from the schools, advocates the reading of the Bible as the remedy. A few months ago Mr. Skinner, State Superintendent of Public Instruction in the State of New York, recognizing the inadequacy of a school system which eliminates religious training entirely, sent a report to the New York Legislature in which he said that he would not stop the reading of the Bible in the schools, although his predecessors had declared such a practice to be a violation of the Constitution. All he wanted to insist on was that no sectarian teaching accompanied the reading of the Bible.[11] In general, whenever Protestants advocate religious instructions in schools they say: "Read the Bible to the children." At times we hear even that some are very indignant at finding that Catholics protest against this scheme. A few reflections, however, will convince any unprejudiced mind that the Catholic position is entirely correct, and that the proposed reading of the Bible is not a sufficient means of inculcating the religious knowledge so sorely needed in the education of youth.

Before attempting to prove these propositions we can eliminate from our discussion one method of reading the Bible which has of late repeatedly been advocated. It has been proposed to restore the Bible to the schools as *literature*. A resolution to this effect has been adopted by the National Educational Association that met at Minneapolis in the summer of 1902: "It is apparent that familiarity with the English Bible as a masterpiece of literature is rapidly decreasing among the pupils in our schools. This is the direct result of a conception which regards the Bible as a theological book merely, and thereby leads to its exclusion from the schools of some States as a subject of reading and study. We hope and ask for such a change of public sentiment in this regard as will permit and encourage the English Bible to be read and studied as a literary work of the highest and purest type side by side with the poetry and prose which it has inspired and in large part formed." Such a reading has, of course, nothing in common with *religious* instruction. Besides, the New York *Evening Post* (July 16, 1902) rightly observed that a literary study of the Bible will never replace the old

[11] New York *Freeman's Journal*, January 24, 1903.

familiarity with the Bible, because the former intimate knowledge of the Bible was acquired by people who studied it as a theological book, and such it is essentially. Moreover, there is another and more serious objection to this scheme. Rightly has Dr. Harris, in his address at Boston, July, 1903, declared that the Bible is "a book sacredly kept apart from other literature." And Mr. Herbert W. Horwill, in a recent article on the "Bible in the Public School,"[12] says that "a merely literary and historical treatment of the Bible would actually impair its moral impression on the young." And how little religious instruction can be expected from this reading may be inferred from the fact that even Renan and Huxley have advocated such study of the Bible. It is a deplorable degradation of the sacred volume to put it on a par with profane writings, be they of the highest and purest type. And it is to be apprehended that such a method would destroy the reverence due to this divinely inspired book. Hence the scheme is not only inefficient, but wrong in principle and pernicious in its results.

Besides, no literary and historical study is worth the time spent on it, unless the teacher enters upon the matter, the ideas, the thoughts, the sentiments and principles of the masterpiece which is studied. But how is it possible to treat the matter, the thoughts and principles contained in the Bible without entering on religious discussions? And yet all religious comment must, according to the patrons of this new system, be scrupulously avoided. Hence, the very essence and characteristic feature of the sacred literature would have to be ignored and neglected. For the Bible is primarily and essentially religious literature. Consequently, this study of the Bible could hardly be profitable even from the merely literary and historical point of view. This is also the opinion of Mr. Horwill in his article in the *Atlantic Monthly*, September, 1903.

Any reasonable study of the Bible must, therefore, view particularly the religious character of the sacred books. But Catholics object to such reading of the Bible in schools which are frequented by Catholic children. They do so not from any neglect, dread or contempt of the sacred books, although such an erroneous view seems still to be a sort of accepted article of faith with many Protestants. The Catholic Church has always venerated and studied the Holy Scriptures, but at the same time affirms that there is an unwritten word of God, namely, Apostolical Tradition. Moreover, different from a popular Protestant theory, which makes it the right and duty of each individual to interpret the Bible for himself, Catholics believe that it belongs to the Church alone to determine the true sense of the Sacred Scriptures.[13] The Church judges that

[12] *Atlantic Monthly*, September, 1903.

it is not necessary for all to read the Bible, for, as St. Paul says, "faith cometh by hearing," and whole nations received the faith without being able to read the Bible. The Church judges further that the reading of the whole Bible is injurious to the ignorant and children. On this account decrees were issued in the course of centuries prohibiting the reading of the Bible in the vernacular tongue, except in such translations as were sanctioned by the Church and, on difficult points, furnished with annotations from the writings of the Fathers of the Church and approved theologians. The faithful, provided they had sufficient knowledge, were even encouraged to read such Bibles, in order, as Pope Pius VII. said, "to draw from them purity of morals and of doctrine."

These general principles furnish the explanation of the attitude of the Catholic Church in regard to the reading of the Bible in schools. Catholics must first ask: Which translation is to be used? The Catholic Douay and Rheims version? It is almost certain that Protestant parents will object to this course, even in the State of New York, where the law forbids boards of education to determine what version shall be used, if any is admitted.[14] Then the Protestant Bible is to be used? Catholics will object to this version, and rightly so. More than forty years ago a very interesting meeting was held by the American Association for the Advancement of Education.[15] The president of the association, Professor Bache, expressed himself emphatically that moral and religious instruction should form a prominent element in all our systems of public education. Then as now it was said that the sufficient and only allowable means of this instruction was the reading of the Bible. In the discussion one speaker remarked that it was impracticable to teach the Bible in the schools of this country. For, he said, "there are respectable and religious portions of the community that will not yield to it. They will say that the reading of the King James version of the Bible is not warranted by their system of religion, and therefore you are attempting to engraft sectarian influence upon the school." On the same occasion another speaker observed: "As to the Bible being an unsectarian book, I believe that if there is a thoroughly Protestant book anywhere, it is King James' translation of the Bible. It is in vain to say that the book is Catholic, and that all appeal to it; for the Catholics do not appeal to King James' version." This really touches one of the principal objections of the

[13] See the splendid little book, "The Bible and Its Interpreter," by P. H. Casey, S. J.

[14] The legislation of various States on the reading of the Bible is given in the "Report of the Commissioner of Education," 1897-1898, Vol. II., pp. 1539-1574.

[15] Barnard's "American Journal of Education," Vol. II., pp. 153-172.

Catholics to the reading of the Bible in the public schools. Some very apt observations have been made on this subject by Father Heuser in his "Chapters of Bible Study." Catholics claim that in point of fidelity to the original[16]—and this is the essential point when we speak of such a book—the Douay version is superior to the Protestant Bible of King James, though it may be inferior in its English. The strongest proof for the Catholic claim is furnished by the Protestants themselves. For if we compare the first Protestant English version, which departed considerably from the received Catholic text of the Vulgate, with all succeeding revisions, made at various times by the English Protestants, we find that they have steadily returned towards the old Catholic version. This is a confession, however reluctantly made, of past errors on the part of former Protestant translators. These errors consisted to a great extent in rendering the Bible so as to justify Protestant tenets and cast a slur on Catholic doctrines. Thus, to destroy the Catholic argument for the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, Matthew xvi., 18, was translated: "Upon this rock I will build my congregation," instead of "my Church," which latter word was substituted again in later Bibles. The word *presbyteri* was rendered by "elders," *episcopi* by "overseers," etc. These and similar translations expressed distinctly the Protestant view of important points which were the subject of vehement controversy between Protestants and the Catholic Church. In 1871 a new revision of the authorized version was undertaken, the result of which was the Revised Version published between 1881 and 1885. In this edition about *twenty thousand* corrections were made, of which not less than fifty per cent. are textual. Dr. Ellicott, Protestant Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, president of the revising committee, says in the preface to the "Pastoral Epistles:" "It is vain to cheat our souls with the thought that these errors are either insignificant or imaginary. There *are* errors, there *are* inaccuracies, there are misconceptions, there are obscurities, not, indeed, so many in number or so grave in character as some of the forward spirits of the day would persuade us." Still, to a Catholic they *are* grave and must be so. In the Revised Version some of the more offensive translations have been changed, and that in the direction of the Catholic version. Thus the Catholic Bible translates the passage I. Cor. ii., 27, correctly, according to the original: "Whosoever shall eat the bread, *or* drink the cup." The Protestant Bible had "and" instead of "or," and Protestants were wont to abuse the Catholic Church for giving the Blessed Sacrament to the laity under one species, as opposed to Scripture. Now, after three hun-

[16] It will be well to remind the reader of Ward's excellent book: "The Errata of the Protestant Bible."

dred years the Revised Version at last does justice to the true text by giving *or*, as the Catholic Bibles had always maintained. In some passages the *episcopi* have become "bishops," whereas in others they remain "overseers," perhaps because the *presbyteri* (priests) have remained "elders." In St. Matthew (vi., 13) the doxology, "For thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever," has at length been left out in the Revised Version, and only in a footnote is it stated that the passage is to be found in some ancient manuscripts. But they are not the best and most ancient manuscripts.

Thus the Protestant revisers have at last done away with the reproach frequently made against the Catholic Vulgate and the Rhemish Version. It has even happened that Catholic children, in "non-sectarian" schools, were punished for refusing to add this spurious doxology in the recital of the Lord's Prayer. An incident of this kind, which occurred in Illinois, has been related by the *Review* (St. Louis, February 28, 1901). Such facts may be rare, but they show not only that the teachers in question were both ignorant and bigoted, but also that the public schools are not always as "unsectarian" as they pretend to be, and that Catholic parents have good reasons to distrust the undenominational schools.

The case of the German Bible is very much like that of the English. From a literary point of view Luther's Bible was in many regards superior to the Catholic translations existing before Luther's time—eighteen different editions of the complete Bible in German, previous to Luther's, are still extant. Still, even enthusiastic admirers of Luther admit that it not only contains many improper, coarse and vulgar expressions, but, what is worse, that it contains most serious errors of translation. It is well known that the Reformer of Wittenberg took the greatest possible liberties in rendering the sacred text, so as to make it fit his peculiar tenets. Thus he rejected the whole epistle of St. James because it directly contradicted his teaching of justification by faith alone; he even added words, so as to bring out his own views; thus in the epistle to the Romans he added the word "alone," "man is justified by faith *alone*." The Protestant scholar Bunsen declares that "Luther's Bible is most inaccurate, although showing traces of great genius; three thousand passages need to be corrected."[17] Palmer, a distinguished Protestant theologian, admonished the preachers: "Never tell the people that this or that passage has been wrongly translated by Luther; this is a secret which must be hushed in silence; at the most admit that the translation is obscure, not clear."[18] We might

[17] Janssen, "Geschichte des deutschen Volkes," Vol. VII., p. 553.
[18] Ibid, p. 554.

here point out how wofully Protestants were deceived by those who talked so loudly about the "pure and unadulterated word of God," which they claimed for their translations. But for our present purpose it will suffice to ask whether the Catholic Church was not justified in forbidding her children to read unapproved versions of the Bible, and whether Catholics are to be reprehended for not trusting the Protestant Bible?

In many places, at least in Europe, it is the custom to give the children the whole Bible. To such a practice the Catholic Church has always objected. It has been said that the Church is afraid lest the "full" truth might be discovered from the Bible and "Romish superstitions" be exposed. The Church never entertained any such dread. Her anxiety at seeing the whole Bible in the hands of the young sprang from a motive of maternal love and care for the little ones. The *unabridged* Bible is no suitable book for the young. The reasons of the Church's anxiety ought to be obvious to every thoughtful Christian. The Bible relates not only virtuous actions, but also evil deeds of men, and that in such a manner that some passages will give occasion to abuse on the part of young and light-minded readers. It is true that to the pure everything is pure; but it is equally true that not all are pure. And it is an awful thought that the most sacred book should be abused by the impure to gratify their unholy curiosity and even to teach others what they should not know. And yet this happens in the case of the unabridged Bible. Let one, who was a Protestant, narrate what effect this reading of the Bible had on him in his earlier years. In a little book, entitled "Adventures of a Protestant in Search of a Religion" (New York, Sadlier, 1878, p. 40), we find the following passage: "The first book my mother gave me was a Bible. I learned to read it at her knee. . . . Of course, I understood nothing of it, and nobody, as far as I can remember, attempted to explain it. But I know it had a great effect on my mind; and it could not have been right to let me read it so young. . . . I read strange things in the Old Testament about killing thousands of people, even little babies, at the command of God; of terrible wars conducted for the purpose of making room for the Jews; and this seemed to tally ill with what my teacher said good people ought to do. I can see now why all these things were written, but cannot think it was right to fill a child's mind with slaughter and blood before he could possibly understand anything about it. And when I went to the Bible class I remember with shame how we lads would take a pride in searching out, on the sly, for passages to laugh at and deride, and can trace little if any good effect from such undue familiarity with sacred things. I think every good purpose would have been

served if careful selections had been made from Holy Scripture for our reading and the rest left till we were old enough to know how to appreciate it."

Now, lest it be said that these views of a man who went over to "Romanism" do not prove the point under discussion, we quote a passage from a modern standard work on higher education, the author of which is a Protestant and director of one of the best training schools for teachers in Germany. Professor Schiller, speaking of the causes of impurity among students, finds one cause in the reading of the unabridged Bible. He says that a *large experience has proved* that most deplorable vicious habits among pupils in schools, boys and girls, sprang up in the first place from the reading of certain passages of the Bible, the selection and knowledge of which were handed down traditionally among young people. Hence he sees a great danger for the moral purity of the pupils in the Protestant custom of giving the complete Bible into their hands. This danger, he says, can be so easily avoided by preparing special school Bibles that it is unintelligible how the whole Bible can be given to pupils.[19] Other Protestant scholars and divines, as O'Callaghan, Semler, Delbrück, etc., have condemned the Protestant practice in this regard.

But let us suppose that the school boards would permit the use of the Catholic version in the public schools, would the Catholics then consent to the reading of the Bible? They would not consent to a reading carried on according to the principles laid down by the advocates of the system. Practically all of them wish the Bible to be read, "without any sectarian teaching," without "note and comment," as the charter of the city of New York and many similar documents declare. In the *Biblical World* (October, 1902) we read the following: "Can we not teach religion and morals by means of the Bible without at the same time teaching sectarian ideas? The Bible is not sectarian; Roman Catholics and all Protestant denominations equally claim it. The formal creeds and the systems of government and worship which have grown up in the centuries of Christian history are post-biblical; they are superstructure built upon the fundamentals of Christianity as recorded in the Bible. Can we get beneath ecclesiastical formulations, regulations and liturgies to a fundamental religious belief and moral practice upon which all Christians can agree and which they can unite to promote? . . . We believe that sectarianism is fast disappearing, that an era of unity in essentials is near at hand. . . . In order to restore the Bible to the schools it must be taught in the right way—the way which accords with the best knowledge of the Bible,

[19] "Handbuch der praktischen Pädagogik" (3 ed., Leipsic, 1894), p. 171.

the best modern science of religious and ethical teaching and the best Christian spirit which recognizes true Christianty wherever it exists and is able to distinguish between essentials and non-essentials." Now, every intelligent man must see that this is nothing but that unsectarian, undenominational teaching of religion which has been so severely criticized and justly ridiculed by many distinguished Protestants. I am convinced that not a few Protestants will object to the latitudinarian views of the writer in the *Biblical World;* certainly all Catholics will protest against the statement that the formal creed is merely a post-biblical superstructure, and they will suspect and mistrust the way of teaching the Bible "according to the best modern knowledge of the Bible, the best modern science of religion." They will fear that this modern knowledge is largely influenced by the rationalistic views of Harnack and other leaders of modern Protestant thought. And their apprehensions are surely not without solid foundation when they hear that the disappearance of sectarianism is hailed as a most welcome sign. They will fear that a reading of the Bible carried on in this spirit will sap the very foundations of historic Christianity.

However, will not all dangers be obviated if the Bible is read without any explanation, without "note and comment," as the phrase is? Let us hear what Protestants have said on this subject. Dr. Schaffer, State Superintendent of Schools, Pennsylvania, said at the last convention of the National Educational Association: "Unless the Bible is properly read, I would not have it read at all."[20] But the "without note and comment" reading is not the proper reading. This has been very emphatically stated by an eminent Protestant statesman and writer. Disraeli says on this system: "I cannot imagine anything more absurd than that a teacher should read 'without note and comment,' as it is called, a passage from the Bible, and that children should be expected to profit by it. The 'without note and comment' people, in their anxiety to ward off proselytism, seem to have forgotten that if there is any book in the world which demands more explanation than another, it is the Bible. And so if nothing else is possible than such a feeble and useless compromise as this, I would, in the interest of the Bible itself, not have it read at all."[21] In a speech in the House of Commons the same statesman had said: "There are but few of us who read chapters in either the Old or New Testament who do not require comment, and sometimes considerable, upon them." And yet children in the primary schools are expected to profit greatly by a reading without the least explanation! They are expected to derive from such a read-

20 *Boston Evening Transcript*, July 7, 1903.

21 "Reminiscences," quoted in the *Fortnightly Review*, May, 1896.

ing all the necessary knowledge of religion and all the moral strength needed in the battles of life! Would we not laugh at a physician who thought it enough to *show* his patient a very salutary medicine and expected to cure him by this method? A cure can be effected only if the medicine is taken and absorbed by the system. Can the intellect of the young be enlightened and their will be strengthened by truths which they do not understand? If a teacher attempted to teach any branch without thoroughly explaining it; if he thought it sufficient just to read it to his pupils, such a teacher would be dismissed from the school without further ado. And rightly so; for he would show that he lacks the most elementary notions of pedagogy. But in the case of the most important and most difficult subject, the Bible and religion, that absurd system is to be adopted! It is advocated by men who in other lines of education manifest a keen insight into human nature and good educational sense. How is this inconsistency and want of logic to be explained? They see the necessity of religious training and yet they cling stubbornly to their cherished unsectarian school; they put a weak plaster on a dangerous ulcer, where a radical operation is needed. They will not succeed until they become convinced that any religious education worth the name can be given only on the basis of denominational principles in denominational schools.

However, could not some *general* explanation be given? The *Biblical World*, October, 1902, declared that the Bible should be read only for general and ethical religious instruction, not for the inculcation of any sectarian and theological ideas. We know what to think of that "general religious" training. A German Protestant, professor in the University of Strasburg, a man of very advanced views, not long ago emphatically stated that such "general" training in religion is "sheer nonsense, as all religion is denominational."[22] Besides, even if such general explanations would be given, Catholics would always suspect that Protestant teachers would, at least unconsciously, instill their own ideas. The *Biblical World* says in the passage referred to that "Protestant teachers taught the Bible in a way which antagonized the Roman Catholics, and teachers of the several Protestant denominations interpreted the Bible to the children from their own point of view." Can we expect that it ever will and, considering human nature, can be otherwise? We think not. Hence that general and ethical religious interpretation is as unpracticable as it is inefficient for the purpose for which it is recommended.

Could not *selections* from the Bible be made of such passages as will offend no one? This has been suggested lately. But we think

[22] Ziegler, "Allgemeine Pädagogik," Leipsic, 1901, p. 107.

the objections dwelt on hitherto must be raised also against the reading of selections in schools where there are children of different denominations. Selections as well as the whole Bible need explanations, and the "without note and comment" reading of single passages is as useless as the reading of the whole Bible. Let us see how select passages could be read, consistently with undenominational principles. What can be selected from the Old Testament? We grant that a great number of passages from the *didactic* books, the Psalms, etc., could be selected which contain valuable ethical injunctions. But shall the teacher be allowed to declare that these books are divinely inspired? I think not; for this would be teaching "dogma." But if this is not taught, the passages will not have that authority which is attributed to them by all sincere Christians, hence it is scarcely an instruction in the Bible. Shall any *historical* passages be permitted? There can be no doubt that the Biblical accounts of the creation, the deluge, the destruction of the wicked cities of Sodom and Gomorrha, the election of Abraham, etc., are not only necessary for a satisfactory understanding of the New Testament, but also contain most valuable ethical lessons. Shall they be read? Suppose they are read, must not the pupils ask whether these accounts are true history or mere legends? What will the teacher do? If he believes these accounts to be true history, and states his conviction, he teaches dogma, which, according to the system advocated, he is not allowed to do. If he belongs to the more advanced Protestants and considers them merely adaptations of the Babylonian myths, shall he tell the pupils his conviction? In that case, too, he would teach dogma, although a false and pernicious one. Or shall he give an evasive answer and thus instill doubt in the minds of the young? It cannot be denied that in this country there are teachers who entertain rather "liberal" views in regard to the Old Testament. One may infer this from the attitude of the ministers of various denominations, as evinced by recent discussions about the story of "Jonah and the whale," and other narratives of the Bible. It may be worse in other countries, for instance in Germany. As an illustration we refer to the recent discussions about the book and the lectures of Professor Delitzsch on "Babel and the Bible,"[23] or to an article which appeared a few months ago in one of the leading educational reviews in Germany.[24] The article is headed: "Some Objections to the Reading of Old Testament Stories in Secondary Schools." The author represents it as an intolerable and outrageous state of affairs that Protestant theologians are obliged to teach the *myths* of the Old Testament as

[23] See the *Catholic Mind*, No. 8, April 22, 1903: "The Bible and Assyriology."
[24] "Monatschrift für höhere Schulen," Berlin, October, 1902.

historical facts. He further asserts that the *majority* of the Protestant theologians who teach in higher schools do not consider the deluge, the account of the creation, the story of the tower of Babel as historical. For this reason they should not be taught in the lower classes; in the higher classes, according to this author, the Old Testament history may be taught as part of the history of religions. There the teacher may tell the students "what opinions the Jews entertained about the creation of the world," etc. That some people in America have similar views of the Bible need not be proved; how many teachers hold such opinions I am not able to determine. But Catholics suspect the teaching of Protestants in this regard; for, as the individual has the right of private judgment in religious matters, also in regard to the Bible, no one knows how far advanced this or that individual teacher may be in his views. There are certainly still many Protestants who firmly believe in the Divine inspiration of Scripture, but are they the majority? More than thirty years ago Professor Hettinger said that Protestant criticism had explained the Bible away so completely as to leave nothing but the cover. The latest theories advocated by the leading Protestant scholars, as Harnack and others, go very far to prove this assertion. All this must make a Catholic feel uneasy at the thought that Protestants should teach his children the Bible, which he firmly believes to be an inspired book in all its parts.

Well, then, let the *selections* be made *from the New Testament*. Will this remove all difficulties? By no means; "higher criticism" has not dealt more leniently with the New Testament than with the Old, and what parent can know the attitude of the teacher of his children toward the Gospels? But granted that the teacher is a believer in the inspired character of the New Testament, what course will he take in the explanations? For, we repeat, some sort of explanation is absolutely necessary. Further, what is he going to read? Are any *miracles* of Christ included in the selections? If all miracles are excluded, it cannot be said that the *Gospel* is taught; for the miracles form an essential part of the life of Christ. It is said of Him that "he began to *do* and to teach" (Acts i., 1), and an account of Christ without the miracles would be a caricature. Moreover, do not His miracles present most beautiful ethical lessons? Does the feeding of the multitude, the raising of the widow's son and of Lazarus, the healing of the blind and the sick not contain most important injunctions of mercy and love for our neighbor? But suppose miracles are included in the selections, then the question will naturally rise in the minds of the pupils: Is this true? And if true, how was this possible? This question, whether directly proposed by the pupils or not, must be answered. If not, doubt will

remain in the minds of the young. But how is an answer possible without teaching dogma? If the teacher gives the true explanation he has to state that Christ was God and wrought these signs as a token of His infinite mercy and, at the same time, as proofs of His Divine character, as He Himself expressly declares in many passages.

Shall the great and fundamental *mysteries* of the Gospel be included in the selections: the story of Bethlehem and of Calvary? How can they be understood unless a solid dogmatic explanation is given? What makes the Babe in the manger so attractive to the Christian heart and inspires it with genuine love and high resolve of a virtuous life? Nothing but the fact that this weak child is the Eternal Word Incarnate, who "came down from heaven for our sake in order to bring us salvation," as the Creed has it. Or that awful tragedy of the cross? If the child is not told that the meek and humble sufferer is the Son of God, who voluntarily took upon Himself disgrace, torments and death in order to atone for our sins and to redeem us from eternal death—if such instruction is not given, the child may pity the innocent victim of the hatred of the Pharisees, but it will not rise to any religious sentiment nor to any noble moral resolutions. To such a child the cross will remain "foolishness," as it was to the heathen of old. Again, take that solemn and awe-inspiring scene before Caiphas, where Christ is conjured to declare whether he is the Son of the living God. How can this be understood without dogmatic teaching that He who stands there as a meek lamb before the wolves is in truth the Son of God and the future judge of the world? In short, the whole life and character of Christ is unintelligible without solid dogmatic teaching. Now, the teacher has to say either that this Christ was a great and wise man, but nothing more, and in this case the "dogma" of the Unitarian is taught, and every parent who believes in the Divinity of our Lord must earnestly protest against such teaching, or the teacher says that this great man was not mere man, but truly God; then the Unitarian will object, not to mention the case where the children of Jewish parents may be present.

Accordingly, the miracles and the characteristic scenes of the life of Christ must go; but have we not enough left in the beautiful *words* of the great Master? In fact, it has often been suggested to confine the New Testament reading chiefly to the discourses of Christ. But can the words of Christ be understood without dogmatic explanation? There is in the literature of the whole world nothing more beautiful, more elevating and inspiring than the *parables* of our Lord. Read them to the children. Yet how can the true meaning of these allegories be grasped by the young with-

out comment? Who are the sower, the reapers, the enemy? What is the field and the fire into which the tares are cast? What the banquet of the King, the wedding garment, the vineyard, the laborers' wages? Read the parable of Lazarus and Dives. What is that hell mentioned there? Is there such a thing as hell, is there any fire, is hell eternal? These and similar questions necessarily will rise in the minds of the children. Shall they be answered? And if so, how? Or are these parables to be read only in a mutilated form? Then the whole purport is lost and it would be better not to read them at all. It has been frequently proposed to read the *Sermon on the Mount*, especially the Beatitudes. Very well. But who are the poor in spirit, the clean of heart? What is the promised Kingdom of Heaven? And if it were asked, as it ought to be, why we should accept such doctrine, why we should consider the poor in spirit blessed, why we should strive after perfect cleanness of heart and body—shall it be said that such principles are noble? Will this suffice for light-minded youths in whose hearts the animal instincts are so powerful and the will-power so weak? Or shall it be said that the teacher who uttered them was so wise and his maxims so beautiful? Then we might read to the children Plato's dialogues, where he pictures the great teacher of Athens and narrates many beautiful sayings; we need not object even to the reading of Buddhist maxims, which some have wished—blasphemously, as every Christian says—to be substituted for the principles of Christianity. I say we need not object to such reading if we want merely to read beautiful maxims; for there are such in pagan writings. But the characteristic of the reading of the Bible—teaching with *authority*—will perish unless it is clearly stated, as the Bible does state, that he who spoke thus had supreme authority, to which every man must submit. From the lips of the Divine Teacher came words of grace and beauty, but above all He spoke with supreme authority: "He was teaching as one having power and not as the scribes" (Mark i., 22). This power can never be expected from reading the words of Christ unless the Divine nature of the Great Teacher is clearly set forth.

One point, then, is evident, namely, that no reading of the Bible can be fruitful without interpretation, and no interpretation can be given which does not assume some definite attitude towards dogma, towards some specified creed. Hence we are justified in saying that the problem of religious instruction cannot be solved by reading the Bible, as suggested by many Protestant educators. We readily admit that the recent movement for the introduction of the reading of the Bible is inspired by the best and noblest motives, and we honor the efforts of Protestant educators in this regard. But we

regret to see them adopt means which certainly will prove a failure. For the remedy which they wish to apply is an inefficient one. A Catholic cannot help noticing another feature in the discussions of Protestants on this great problem, namely, a lack of consistency and courage. They deplore the present state of affairs, the decline of religion in the young; they suggest remedies, devise new plans and methods of teaching religion; but they do not dare to say plainly and boldly that the much vaunted public system is wrong in a most fundamental principle. For there can be no reasonable doubt as to the only efficient remedy: religion must be taught in the schools, but any religious teaching worth the name is possible only in *denominational* schools. The catechism must be taught; the Bible must be read, and a great deal of it, but it must be explained according to the dogmas of the Church. For the Church has received the sacred injunction to lead mankind to its final destination. To the Church, and not to the State nor to any school board, has the Divine Master, to whom "is given all power in heaven and on earth," addressed the words: "Go ye into the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature." For this reason Catholics oppose the school system which excludes religion. He who is not for Christ is against Him, and separation from Him is ruin and death; an education that excludes him is "Christless" and, therefore, really "godless." It has rightly been said that if to-day Christ were on earth and should enter almost any public school in the country, the teacher, acting on his instructions, would have to show Him the door. If He were to enter many a private school, He would be worshiped by teacher and scholar on bended knee. This would surely be the case in Catholic schools.

These principles hold good of *secondary and higher education* as well as of the primary.[25] It is a widespread error, at least in practice, that it is sufficient to teach religion in the lower schools. This system is first of all very incongruous. The student in the higher schools makes daily progress in secular knowledge, and that which is far higher, far nobler and far more important, the knowledge of his religion, remains what it was in childhood. This is certainly not a harmonious development of the highest faculties of the student's mind. The Christian idea of progress is that the young should "advance in wisdom and grace" not only before man, but above all before God; not only in human, but especially in Divine knowledge.

This system of confining religious instruction to the primary

[25] On this subject see also the present writer's recent work: "Jesuit Education, Its History and Principles Viewed in the Light of Modern Educational Problems" (Herder, St. Louis, 1903), particularly chapter xviii., "Religious Instruction."

schools is also fraught with the greatest dangers. Especially in these days, when agnosticism or even open hostility towards revealed religion domineer in science and literature, the student of higher institutions of learning must be safeguarded against the sophisms of infidelity. Hundreds of objections against the doctrines of Christianity which he learned in his childhood will be cast in his way, objections from philosophy, natural sciences, history and Biblical criticism. He will hear that scientists deny the spirituality and immortality of the soul, free will, the existence of God; arguments from archæology are arrayed against the authenticity of the Bible, against the historic character of the Mosaic records; arguments from philosophy against the Divinity of Christ, and numberless arguments from history against the doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church. What will happen if no solid course of religious instruction is given, which in the higher grades must be largely apologetical? Doubts will arise as to the truth of what he was taught in his childhood; they will grow stronger and more dangerous, and having no guide to solve them, the young man will soon succumb and swell the ranks of agnostics or infidels. This calamity would have been avoided if a course of apologetics had accompanied the training in secular knowledge; if the student had heard that the six days of creation, which seem to contradict the established results of geology and paleontology, need not be taken as days of twenty-four hours each, but as long periods, or as six revelations made on successive days to Adam or Moses; if he had been instructed that the miracle related in the book of Josue need not mean that the sun actually stood still. If such and similar explanations had been given the student, the loss of his faith would have been avoided. If numerous facts of history had been correctly stated and explained, he would not have been weakened in his love for his Church; he would have been able to solve the difficulties made by infidels; he would have been able to remove many a prejudice from the minds of his Protestant fellow-men.

In this connection we may be permitted to quote at some length a beautiful passage from the writings of the great Cardinal Newman. He says a Catholic youth who has received a higher education "should know the great primitive divisions of Christianity, its polity, its luminaries, its acts and its fortunes, its great eras and its course down to this day. He should have some idea of its propagation and of the order in which the nations which have submitted to it entered its pale;[26] and of the list of its Fathers, and of its writers generally,

[26] Such an outline of history is contained in the three volumes of the "History of the Christian Era," by Father Guggenberger (Herder, St. Louis, Mo., 1899-1901).

and of the subjects of their works. And so in like manner, as regards Biblical knowledge, it is desirable that, while our students are encouraged to pursue the history of classical literature, they should also be invited to acquaint themselves with some general facts about the canon of Holy Scripture, its history, the Jewish canon, St. Jerome, the Protestant Bible; again, about the languages of Scripture, the contents of its separate books, their authors and their versions.

"But now as to theology itself. . . . Certainly I admit that when a lawyer, or physician, or statesman, or merchant, or soldier sets about discussing theological points, he is likely to succeed as ill as an ecclesiastic who meddles with law, or medicine, or the exchange. But I would encourage Christian knowledge so far as it bears upon the history, the literature and the philosophy of Christianity. . . . I should desire to encourage in our students an intelligent apprehension of the relations, as I may call them, with society at large . . . the respective prerogatives of the Church and the civil power; what the Church claims of necessity, what it cannot dispense with, what it can; whether the celibacy of the clergy is a matter of faith; what is the difference between canon and civil law, what is meant by intention, what by the *opus operatum*. Questions may be multiplied without limit which occur in conversation between friends, in social intercourse or in the business of life, when no argument is needed, no subtle disquisition, but a few direct words stating the fact, and when perhaps a few words may even hinder most serious inconveniences to the Catholic body. Half the controversies which go on in the world arise from ignorance of the facts of the case; half the prejudices against Catholicity lie in the misinformation of the prejudiced parties. Candid persons are set right and enemies silenced by the mere statement of what it is that we believe. It will not answer the purpose of a Catholic to say, 'I leave it to theologians; I will ask my priest;' but it will commonly give him a triumph as easy as it is complete if he can then and there lay down the law."[27]

Any one acquainted with contemporary literature will agree with the great Cardinal. How often has it been stated by Catholics that Papal Infallibility does not mean impeccability—Catholics do not deny the scandals of John XII. or Alexander VI.—nor that it is infallibility in private opinions, but merely freedom from error in an authoritative, *ex cathedra* decision in matters of faith and morals; that Catholics do not *adore* the mother of God, but venerate her; that indulgences are not remission of sin, least of all of future sins, but of temporal punishment due to sin after its remission; and yet the same misrepresentations are repeated. The old errors about

[27] "Idea of a University," pp. 372-378.

prohibition of Bible reading, the calumnies of immured nuns, of Pope Joan, of the *Monita Secreta*, of Jesuit superiors obliging their subjects "to commit sin," of the Jesuits teaching that "the end justifies the means," these and countless other slanders have been refuted a thousand times, and yet they continue to be made. The cause of truth and justice, if not that of religion, make it a necessity for all Catholics, especially the educated, to be well informed on these questions. And it is the duty of college instructors to impart this knowledge. It may not be useless for teachers in Catholic colleges to ask themselves whether they actually fulfil this duty to the extent and in the manner which are imperatively demanded at the present day, and whether they give the pupils, especially in higher classes, that apologetical and solid dogmatical training which is so necessary? This question may furnish matter for serious and conscientious self-examination, and if the answer should be a sorrowful "peccavimus," the remedy of this defect is obvious.

It has been said in England and in this country that at many public institutions the faith of Catholics will be in no danger, as they will be obliged (as in England) or have at least an opportunity, to attend their own church, and as the local priests may look after their spiritual instruction. This evasion, for it is no more, has been well answered by Father John Gerard, S. J.: "Can it possibly be supposed that those brought up under such conditions should learn to regard their faith as their supreme treasure, the pearl of great price to purchase which a man does well to sacrifice all else? Who that has experience of the waywardness and perversity of youth, who knows how hard a task it is under the most favorable of conditions to produce such loyalty to the Church as will stand the stress and strain of life, and has learnt by experience how plastic is boy nature to take a shape from every influence to which it is exposed, will not realize how impossible it is to anticipate, at least in the vast majority of instances, that anything resembling a true Catholic spirit should result from such a manner of bringing up? Living in an atmosphere which must necessarily be altogether alien from that of faith, in close intimacy with those, whether teachers or comrades, who regard that faith with contemptuous dislike or at best with utter indifference, how shall a poor boy find in an occasional visit to a church or a presbytery influences potent enough to enable him to realize the surpassing importance of that for which so scanty provision seems to be considered sufficient? Certainly an education upon such lines does not appear calculated to produce men of the type that risked fortune and liberty in order that their children's education should before all else be Catholic."[28]

[28] The London *Tablet*, September 14, 1901.

Catholics, therefore, rightly distrust any school, primary or secondary, from which the teaching of their religion is excluded. And all other advantages that may seem to accrue to them from such a system of public instruction must appear to them as trifles compared to the one consideration which the Eternal Truth and Wisdom has pronounced: "What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his own soul"—and the souls of those who are dearest to him on earth, his children? How noble, how heroic is the generosity of those Catholic parents who are willing to make any sacrifice in order to give their children a thoroughly Christian education. This, indeed, is a practical application of our Lord's sacred injunction: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His justice."

What, then, follows from these truths? A conclusion which the late Pontiff, Leo XIII., has proclaimed in 1897, on the occasion of the centenary of Blessed Peter Canisius, the founder of several famous Catholic colleges throughout Germany, Austria and Switzerland. "All schools, from the elementary to the university, should be thoroughly Catholic, and one of the main duties of the pastors of the Church is to safeguard the rights of parents and the Church in this matter. It is of the very greatest importance that Catholics should have everywhere for their children not mixed schools, but their own schools, and these provided with good and well-trained masters. Let no one delude himself that a sound moral training can be separated from dogmatic religious training. To separate the training in knowledge from all religious influence is to form citizens to be the bane and pest of society instead of being the bulwark of their country. Moreover, it is not for youths to be taught religion at fixed hours, but all their training must be permeated by religious principles."

This is the Catholic position in regard to religious instruction. These are the truths which they uphold against the errors prevalent in so many modern systems of education. The position of the Catholics is reasonable and is the practical application of the principles taught by the Divine Master, who alone is "the Way, the Truth and the Life." This is the road by which the Church endeavors to lead the children to Christ, complying with the loving wish of the Divine friend of children: "Suffer little children to come to me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven."

R. Schwickerath, S. J.

Woodstock, Md.

CHAPTERS IN IRISH HISTORY CONNECTED WITH THE UNION, AND THE ATTEMPT TO ENACT THE VETO.

1. Historical Review of the State of Ireland, From the Invasion of Henry II. to its Union With Great Britain in 1801. By Francis Plowden, Esq. 3 vols., quarto, each 1,200 pages. London, 1803.

2. Memoirs of the Life and Times of the Right Hon. Henry Grattan. By his son, Henry Grattan, Esq., M. P. 5 vols, octavo, each 600 pages. London: Henry Colborn, 1849.

3. The Life of the Right Honorable John Philpot Curran, Master of the Rolls in Ireland. By his son, William Henry Curran. Edited by R. Shelton Mackenzie, D. C. L. 1 vol., 6 mo., pp. 550. Redfield, New York, 1855.

THE eclipse of the Stuart dynasty and the accession of the line of Orange princes to the British throne had had a serious effect upon the status of the Roman Catholic religion in Great Britain and Ireland. In the latter kingdom, where four-fifths of the natives of the soil had adhered to the faith of their ancestors, its worst consequences had been experienced. In no part of Europe were there in existence such revolting penal laws against the practice of the Catholic religion as were to be found in the British code! And nowhere else in all Europe were such laws so brutally enforced as in Ireland. That the ancient faith which had been planted by Christian fathers in the "Island of Saints" had not been wiped out of existence during the dark periods of bloody persecution was owing to the Divine promise that the powers of hell should not prevail against the Church of Christ! To state the facts plainly, the code of laws under which the people of both kingdoms were governed had for their foundation the axiom "No Popery." The king, the princes and the Government swore by the same motto, "No Popery."

The non-Catholic population of Ireland, aggregating probably three-fourths of a million souls (1782), comprised the privileged classes. They alone of the people of the kingdom, high or low, could hold office "under the crown." They alone could enter government colleges and acquire degrees. To this class the professions were open, with the privileges of practising in the courts and of attaining the judicial hierarchy. They alone could obtain commissions in the army and navy and obtain other innumerable privileges which no Catholic was permitted to enjoy.

Co-existing was "The Church by Law Established," as O'Connell was accustomed to qualify its claims for reverence, with its hierarchy and its regiment of 900 fat salaried incumbents, occupying the places and emoluments and the spoliated foundations and livings which had been wrested from the hierarchy and clergy of the Roman Catholic

faith, and who, although, it is claimed, were inferior and unlearned as a class, were provided for by incomes from tithes, from the payment of which none were exempt. Besides, the incumbents of the "established church" had been given the exclusive custody of the official parochial registers of births, marriages and of mortality of all classes and creeds, the fees of which were rigorously exacted, which in the aggregate materially added to their salaries.

Such was the incubus fastened on the Irish people, including the dissenting non-Catholic sects. Among the latter were the Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, who were most generally to be found in the northern parts, and the Quakers in the cities and towns. All these sects were compelled to build their respective places of worship, to maintain these structures and to support their own ministers, while they were obliged by law to pay their share of tithes for the support of the incumbents of the Church of England in common with the preponderating members of the Roman Catholic Church. Tithes being an annual extortion were most severely felt and became a standing and a popular grievance, the cause of outbreaks and excesses disgraceful to a civilized people and detrimental to the cause of religion.[1]

The exorbitant demands which were made by the agents of the Protestant clergy, who were denominated *tithe proctors*, increased ten fold the original evil. They were generally a needy and low race of men, who had but little regard for the interests of their employers or the wants of the people; they performed their invidious task at some hazard and without much feeling. They required a high percentage; their charges were excessive and the mode of collection insolent, haughty and exasperating. Here is a partial list of tithes exacted by the Protestant incumbents:

A barrel of grain for every plough in some places; 2 quarts of wheat for every acre ploughed; in other places, one sheaf of some sort of grain for every horse at the plough; 32 quarts of oats and one quart of wheat for every hack horse at the plough at lenten time. In Connaught, 6 pence per year for married couples; those couples living a long time must come to court, prove their marriage and then pay about $2 for their certificate. In Connaught also a crock of butter from each family once a year. From a poor man having but one cow a sheep was exacted annually; for well-to-do people, *their best garment* was confiscated and the *best garment of a woman* of like condition shared the same fate. Every brewery paid an annual tax of one gallon of its product. If a beggar died in a man's house the owner who had sheltered him had to pay a tax equivalent to about a dollar. If a dead body was carried through another

[1] Grattan, Vol. III., p. 298.

parish for interment a tax must be paid the former equivalent to a burial tax. Parsons, vicars or curates in charge of parish registers not only exacted a registration fee, but they also collected a minimum charge equivalent to one dollar for christenings, marriages and burials registered by them![2]

The demand for tithes was so excessive in some parts of Ireland that many non-Catholics refused payment, and suits at law were commenced for their collection. In Kings, Meath, Westmeath and Queens counties fifty or more suits had been commenced, mostly against Protestants. Many of the latter throughout the kingdom became disgusted with the continuous exactions of the ministers of the Church of England. All through the eighteenth century they emigrated in groups to America. This accounts for the large number of families of Irish stock to be found in Western Pennsylvania. Thus Ireland's loss became America's gain, while the population of the State mentioned as well as of others was enriched by a class of immigrants who as a rule were educated and intelligent, including good farmers and good mechanics.

Finally, but in modern times, during the political sway of William E. Gladstone, an act of Parliament was passed disestablishing the Church of England in Ireland. This was accomplished by the payment of large sums for the purchase of life annuities for Irish prelates and Irish incumbents; for the cancellation of claims made by beneficiaries of the establishment; for compensation for the relinquishment of perquisites of all sorts held by high as well as by low individuals as positions during life, all of which had to be considered, adjudicated and consideration given in money or in life annuities before a final settlement could be made and the incubus of three centuries of standing could be lifted from the economical status of the Irish people.

In 1781-2 had occurred the termination of the American Revolution, when England lost her American colonies. The defensive condition of Ireland was critical. The British forces from necessity had been withdrawn from the kingdom and she was practically unprotected from outside attack on the part of the enemies of the British Empire. *There was not an entire company of British soldiers available in Ireland!*

In this emergency a call for volunteers was made by the leading men of the respective provinces for national defense. This call was promptly responded to and an Irish army, in which were included men of all religious belief, was rapidly organized. England was called upon for arms, munitions, stores and equipments, and she committed the political blunder of arming a force of 80,000

[2] Grattan, III., p. 300.

men who were by no means too friendly to British control. The supreme command of this Irish volunteer army was given to Lord Charlemont.

It was the most powerful and patriotic organization which had ever legally existed on Irish soil. The uniforms of the officers and men were suggestive of the national spirit. Coincidental was the election of the members of the Irish House of Commons of 1782. This to a great extent was perfunctory, as the following details will show:

The County of Antrim had a population of 111,000. It was under the patronage of four earls and one knight, owners of the soil, who controlled five boroughs, each of which had two burgesses to elect for the House of Commons. The electors had 3,500 votes.

The County of Armagh, which elected four burgesses, with a population of 84,000, had 2,400 voters, under the control of the Protestant Primate and the Earl of Charlemont.

The County of Carlow, whose population was 34,200, being mostly Catholic, had only 25 qualified voters. These were controlled by the Protestant Bishop and Mr. William Burton, under whose patronage four burgesses were elected.

The County of Cavan, with a population of 68,000, had 1,800 voters. It had two boroughs and elected four burgesses. It was controlled by the Earl of Cavan and Lord Belmore.

The County of Clare, which had a population of 66,000, with only 848 qualified voters, had three boroughs and elected six burgesses. It was controlled by the Lord of the soil.

The County of Cork, population 250,000, had eleven boroughs. The city of Cork was politically independent. But the balance of the county was under the political control of the absentee Duke of Devonshire; the Earl of Cork, Lords Donneraile, Middleton and Shannon, Sir John Freke and the Jephson and Clifford families. It had 1,243 voters.

The County of Donegal, with a population of 67,000, had five boroughs. It was under the political control of the Lords Arran, Clenmere and Erne and the Knights Connolly and Conyngham, with 2,500 voters.

The County of Down, with a population of 137,000, including the independent town of Drogheda, had six boroughs. Outside of Drogheda the political control was vested in the Lords Bangor, Carrickfane, Clifford and Hillsborough, Sir John Blackwood and Messrs. Stewart and Ponsonby. It had 6,000 voters.

The city of Dublin had a population of 300,000. It was a free city. Outside, the County of Dublin had 57,000. The political

control of the county was vested in John Latouche, the banker, and Mr. Beresford. Electors for city and county, 4,000.

The County of Fermanagh had a population of 30,000, with one borough. It had 2,537 electors.

The County of Galway had three boroughs. Its population was 166,250, which included the town of Galway, with 12,000. Outside of the latter the political control was vested in the Bingham and Blakeny families. The town was controlled by the Daly families. Electors of town and county, 700.

The Catholic County of Kerry, population 75,000, had three boroughs. It was under the political control of Lord Glundore, Sir E. Denny and Mr. Townsend, and had 1,000 electors.

The Catholic County of Kildare, with a population of 50,000, had four boroughs. It was under the political control of the Duke of Leinster and Lord Mayo, and had only 26 electors.

The County of Kilkenny, with a population of 87,000, had five boroughs. Its political control under Lord Clifden was rotten and venal. Otherwise under Sir Hector Langrishe and Messrs. Agar, Flood and Tigue it was blameless. Included in the total population was the city of Kilkenny, with a population of 14,000, controlled by the English Bishop of Ossory. It had 1,050 voters.

Kings County had a population of 48,000, with two boroughs. It was under the political control of Lords Belvidere and Molesworth, associated with Mr. D. B. Daly. It had 900 voters.

The County of Leitrim, with a population of 35,300, had two boroughs. For such a small population it was under the distinguished political control of the Lords Leitrim and Mountrath, Colonel St. George and the King family. It had 1,076 voters.

The County of Limerick had a population of 120,000 and had two boroughs. This included the city of Limerick, with a population of 40,000, whose political status was independent. But the political control otherwise, under the Hon. Hugh Massey and the Hon. Samuel Oliver, was stated to have been venal and rotten. There were 1,250 voters in this county.

The County of Londenderry, with a population of 90,000, had three boroughs. It was under the political patronage of the Earl of Tyrone, the Right Hon. Richard Jackson and Thomas Connolly, with only 724 voters.

Here is the status of the Catholic County of Longford: Population, 40,000, with four boroughs; controlled by Lord Granard, venal and corrupt; Lord Longford, venal and corrupt; Mr. Dillon, venal; Mr. Geeville and Mrs. McCartney, venal and rotten. Total voters, 700.

The County of Louth, population 47,000, had four boroughs and

was under the political control of Right Hon. John Foster, H. Coddington, J. and C. Buxton, Robert Ross and Ross Moore. It had 730 voters.

The Catholic County of Mayo, with a population of 120,000, had one borough, under the political control of Lord Lucan. It had only 1,000 electors.

The County of Meath, population 47,000, had six boroughs. It was under the political control of Lords Bective, Darnley, Ludlow and Mornington, with Sir B. Chapman, Sir George Lowther, James Preston, Abel Ram and Thomas Trotter. The control of James Preston was said to have been venal. The county had 1,200 voters.

The Catholic County of Monaghan had 99,000 population, with one borough. It was under the political control of Lords Clermont and Blaney, whose management was venal. It had only 700 voters.

Queens County had a population of 70,000 and three boroughs. It was under the political management of Lords Carlow, Drogheda and Stanhope, the Rev. Dean Booth and Sir John Parnell, with 1,400 voters.

The Catholic County of Roscommon had a population of 40,000, with three boroughs. It was under the political management of Lords Kingston and Maldon. There were also Mr. Foxlane, Mrs. Walcott and Mrs. Walsingham. It had only 36 voters.

The Catholic County of Sligo, with a population of 36,000, had one borough, which was under the venal management of Owen Wynne, with only 13 voters.

The County of Tipperary, with a population of 111,000, had three boroughs. It was under the political control of Lord Mount Cashel, also Messrs. Barton, Moore, O'Callaghan and Penefather. The whole county was so Catholic that only 1,100 electors were qualified to vote.

The County of Tyrone, with a population of 123,000, had four boroughs. It was under the political control of the Bishop of Clogher, the Lords Abercorn and Welles and Messrs. Moulruy and Richardson. The control of Dungannon was said to have been venal. Total voters, 3,000.

The County of Waterford, with a population of 52,000, which included the city of Waterford, had four boroughs. Outside the city, which was independent, the political control of the remaining 12,000 was under the English absentee Duke of Devonshire and the Lords Shannon and Tyrone. There were only 1,500 voters.

The County of Westmeath had a population of 70,000, with four boroughs. It was under the political control of Rev. Dean Handcock, the Lords Granard and Westmeath, Sir Richard St. George

and Charles Lambert. The management of Fore and Kilbeggan was venal, while the total number of voters was only 1,120.

The Catholic County of Wexford, with a population of 78,000, had eight boroughs. Its political control included Lord Ely and Sir Vincent Coldough, with Messrs. Heare, Leigh, Loftus, Neville, Ram and Charles Tottenham as sharers in its venal political spoils. It had only 917 voters, and the competition for the prey must have been active.

The Catholic County of Wicklow had a more honorable record. Its population was 57,000, with only 900 qualified voters, under the political control of Lords Aldborough, Carysfort, Hillsborough and Mr. William Tighe, whose separate and local jurisdiction seems to have been without reproach.

The total number of voters in all Ireland at this period was 143,485, all of whom were non-Catholic.

The Irish House of Commons of 1782 included 300 members. To which:

Thirty-two counties contributed—Knights	64
Seven cities contributed—citizens	14
University of Dublin	2
One hundred and ten boroughs sent burgesses	220
Total members	300
Returned by the people	81
Returned by patrons	219—300

The Irish House of Lords included one duke, twenty-nine earls, twenty-four viscounts, twenty-six barons and nineteen Protestant archbishops and bishops—in all ninety-nine members.[3]

Home rule, a liberal constitution and an independent Irish Parliament had been forced from England by Ireland in 1782 under the pressure of a well equipped army of Irish volunteers commanded by Lord Charlemont. England nominally governed, through an English Viceroy, the Lord Lieutenant in Dublin Castle, but the control of Irish affairs had been relegated to the Irish Parliament, comprising a House of Lords and a House of Commons, whose sway was supreme.

This home rule government began in 1782 and was destroyed in 1800 by the most corrupt political methods known in modern times, under the sanction of the English Viceroy, Lord Cornwallis, whose factotum in the scandalous work was Lord Castlereagh. *The members of both houses of the Irish Parliament were exclusively non-Catholic.* In fact, throughout the British Empire at the time

[3] Plowden, II., Appendix.

Roman Catholics were disfranchised and subject to odious penal laws.

It was time this change had occurred, for affairs in Ireland were in a sad condition. Her peasantry had become demoralized, while her commerce and manufactures had been hampered and dwarfed by English interference whenever Irish competition got the better of English lines of trade that a partial collapse seemed inevitable. The House of Lords of the Irish Parliament was composed of the Protestant nobility, with the Archbishops and Bishops of the Established Church. The majority of the members of the House of Commons were elected under the patronage of the patrons of the boroughs, while the minority were elected by the independent boroughs and the free towns and cities.

The brightest and most talented of the professions, eminent merchants, shrewd bankers and cultivated gentlemen, combined to make the Irish House of Commons of 1782 one of the most intelligent legislative assemblies in Europe. But all this combination of talent and distinction was, as stated, unfortunately non-Catholic. But what this Parliament accomplished for Ireland is set forth by Mr. Henry Grattan, who compiled the memoirs of his illustrious father, whose efforts are admitted to have secured in this Parliament the constitutional freedom of Ireland. Yet this Parliament, he writes, in spite of its defects, did more for the country in the very short space of time it was allowed to live than England had effected in all her long and varied struggles for liberty.

Ireland removed the restraints that had long been imposed, through English jealousy and opposition, on her commerce and her constitution; she repealed Poyning's law; she insisted on the repeal of the 6th of George the First; she restored the final judicature to her lords; she established free trade; she obtained an independent constitution; she established the independence of her judges; she secured to the country the benefits of the Habeas Corpus Act; she purified the elective franchise; she repealed the Perpetual Mutiny Bill and placed on record the immortal resolve that a standing army in time of peace, without the consent of Parliament, was contrary to law.

All these splendid acquisitions she obtained in 1782, after a short reign, by means of her Parliament, freed from English control and influenced by Irish feelings and Irish counsels. Subsequently, after a severe struggle against a corrupt court, she obtained a Navigation Act, a Pension Bill, a Place Bill and a Responsibility Bill. She diffused the spirit of religious liberty and emancipated, in a degree, the mind of her people. She repealed numerous penal laws and gave to Roman Catholics property and power, and accom-

panied the possession of land with the right of the elective franchise. She opened to the Catholics the Bar and the Assistant Barristers' Bench; and if she had not been thwarted by British influence she would have given them full and complete emancipation and placed in every respect the Roman Catholic on an equality with his Protestant fellow countryman.

England had rights and precedents of her own to follow. She could boast of a proud constitutional ancestry who traced their names—their descent, their glories—in hereditary succession to the Great Charters of their country that they had thirty times confirmed. But no such advantages were possessed by Ireland, where it might be said Ireland had to create almost everything, and to create it out of chaos.

It was a Godlike work, and, like the Divine Creation, required fiends to destroy it.[4] This constitutional era in Irish history, the only bright period in her melancholy political life since the English conquest, lasted eighteen years. During this period England had lost her American colonies, France had abolished the sway of the Bourbons, while her royalty, her nobility of title and of robe perished under the knife of the guillotine. Continental Europe armed in defense of Divine right, but her well equipped armies were repulsed from French soil by the sans-culotte conscripts of Republican France. Napoleon's star had arisen!

Ireland for centuries had been held and governed to a great extent as a conquered country. Here is the proof from official tables. As early as 1682 the estates of absentee owners aggregated nearly a million acres, lying in the best parts of the kingdom, whose owners, living in England, rarely if ever set foot on Irish soil. All these estates yielded to their English owners in the aggregate less than a million dollars a year, a proof that their agents had a rich perquisite in their fiduciary incumbency, while the lands presented a beggarly and miserable appearance. Fifty years later their income had nicreased to $3,350,000, while in 1782 Mr. Arthur Young gave the absentee drain from Ireland as over $11,000,000 a year. In 1805 this drain was estimated at $15,000,000, while in 1828 it amounted to more than $20,000,000 a year.

Some of these absentee holdings aggregated as high as 50,000 acres. Travelers might pass through the fairest parts of Ireland and for an entire day not see the abode of a single resident gentleman, while the occupants of the soil, whenever seen, presented a wild and wretched appearance.

The great majority of the Irish people were of the peasant classes, whose social condition under the prevailing absentee landlord

[4] Grattan, V., pp. 185, et. seq.

régime was probably worse than that of any similar class in Europe. Their land holdings were small, while the annual result of their toil did not always satisfy the exactions of the agents of the landlords and the tithe proctors. Their dwellings, as a rule, were poor, while their habiliment did not protect its wearer during bad seasons. What was worse, the failure of crops during a bad season occasionally resulted in a period of semi-starvation.

But these poor people of Ireland, living under the alien rule of the conqueror of the kingdom, had, however, clung to the faith of their forefathers. Their firm adherence thereto had rendered them odious in the eyes of the "No Popery" government of England, which cared but little about their condition; but their sublime reverence for the Christian laws in which they had been reared and their submission to the Omnipotent, in sunshine or in gloom, restrained passion and made them reconciled to their wretched condition.

The Roman Catholic hierarchy, filling the seats of a prelacy which was founded by Saint Patrick and which had succeeded in unbroken line through ages of persecution without the taint of heresy, was, as a class, among the most distinguished of the mitred heads of the Catholic Church. They usually aggregated thirty prelates, which at all times had included a fair representation of the noble Catholic families of the Island of Saints.

The average number of the clergy of all classes was apparently about 2,500. As a rule they were highly educated men who led saintly lives, who were capable of associating with the most refined and intelligent families in the kingdom, while they sincerely sympathized with and zealously guarded the spiritual interests of the masses of the Irish Catholic people. It may be asked, how, prior to the foundation of the Irish Catholic ecclesiastical college of Maynooth, such a prelacy and such a priesthood had been maintained? Here is the answer: Prior to the French Revolution 478, mostly Irish, Catholic ecclesiastical students were educated in Catholic universities on the continent of Europe. This was the yearly aggregate average. These institutions were in France, Belgium, Portugal, Spain and in Rome; and those of them whose foundations had not been sequestrated during revolutionary convulsions exist at the present day.

Of the aggregate average, 420 received gratuitous education, while 58 were educated at the expense of the Catholic nobility and of the wealthy merchants of Ireland. While 2,500 priests were required for parochial work, deaths, inability and casualties required an annual supplement of 300. Catholic families in both kingdoms maintaining chapels, as has always been customary, were supplied with chaplains from these sources.

Besides the hereditary Catholic noble families whose sons were debarred by penal laws from professional careers in their native land, who offered their swords to the Catholic rulers of Europe, and under whose auspices they won high honors and military renown and formed matrimonial alliances with distinguished families whose Irish names and great wealth are in evidence at the present day in Austria, France, Portugal and Spain, there was another distinct class of smart men such as in France are known as the *bourgeois*—men of capacity who were possessed of wealth, prominent factors in the banking, the commercial and the manufacturing interests; who were steadfast Catholics and reliable friends of the members of the Irish hierarchy and priesthood in their respective localities.

These were mostly identified with the cities and seaport towns of Ireland. They developed and enlarged the manufactures and commerce of the kingdom, but they had been hampered and restricted in this direction by the jealousy of their English competitors. If their woolen fabrics, for instance, excelled in quality and found more ready sale in the English markets than the English goods, an embargo was asked for on their shipment and granted by the British Parliament, and Irish woolens were excluded from English competition. So it was with other lines of Irish goods competing with English manufactures. The linen trade alone of the North of Ireland, with which the English could not compete, held its sway.

In the seaport towns a large export and import trade with the colonies flourished.

Irish ships freighted with provisions, fat cattle, and carrying passengers, sailed regularly for Quebec and returned with cargoes of timber and other colonial products.

The capital required for this commerce was large, but it was always available for legitimate requirements, as there were many eminent and wealthy firms of bankers in Dublin as well as in the seaport cities ready to encourage this trade.

It is not, however, an agreeable task to review the social status of these respectable, these eminent and these wealthy *bourgeois* of the commercial Irish classes of that period. In their homes, in their family life, there was refinement; there was among their class social enjoyment.

The heads of families sent their sons and daughters to the continent to be educated, and to pursue such careers of active or spiritual life as their talents or inclinations favored. In their native homes they were debarred social recognition. They were Papists! They were declassed, relegated to an inferior sphere of social life. In the important towns, long before America knew the meaning of the

term, there were *boards of trade*, whose merchants daily assembled to consult about business affairs.

But in these commercial conclaves a Catholic member, being a Papist, had no standing, although his *cheque* upon the leading local bank might be good for a half million of dollars. He was a Papist! To illustrate: In the board of trade of the city of Galway, which was of ancient origin, which opened at 10 A. M. and closed at 2 P. M., where large transactions were of daily occurrence, there entered one day a Galway merchant of great wealth, who was highly esteemed by his fellow-townsmen.

Under the No Popery regime, in the Galway board of trade meetings, the Protestant members were allowed to wear their hats, while Catholics were obliged to remove their head covering. The merchant referred to above sauntered into the Galway chamber of commerce, ruminating on the operation he had in view, forgetting that he was a Roman Catholic, when he was reminded of this fact by a burly non-Catholic, who knocked off his hat, with the remark that Papists could not wear them on the Galway board of trade. The merchant quietly picked up his hat and retired from the chamber.

At the period of the constitutional victory won by Irish non-Catholics from England in 1782 there remained on Irish soil 44 monuments to the memory of the ancient Church of Ireland. These comprised 25 abbatial structures, including cloisters, friaries, monasteries and priories, most of which were of great extent and of solid stone, cut and ornamented with the chisel of skilled artisans, whose work seemed imperishable, and 19 cathedrals and churches, many of great extent, whose fine outlines gave testimony of the grandeur and magnificent ceremonial of the Irish Church in mediæval times. It was not alone the architectural perfection, exquisite in all the minute details of these structures, which excited admiration, but it was the localities, with one notable exception, in which they had been erected. Ireland abounds in landscape beauty; charming lakes, islands, headlands and valleys were chosen by the eminent saints and churchmen when selecting a site on which a structure was to be reared in honor of Almighty God.

The exception noted above was the Cathedral of Saint Patrick, which had been erected on the summit of the Rock of Cashel, miles above the level of its picturesque surroundings.

It was a cathedral of vast extent and of great architectural perfection.

It was surrounded with strategic defensive protection which served to render its position, in a military point of view, impregnable.

The original structure was destroyed in the fifteenth century, but rebuilt on a more grand and elaborate scale. A century and a half

ago this magnificent monument to Irish Catholic history, in which five centuries previously many great councils had been held, presided over by Papal nuncios, which had remained practically intact, was doomed to destruction by the Anglican Archbishop Price, who had been appointed to the archiepiscopal see in 1744; as this Protestant functionary could not drive in his carriage to the Cathedral door on account of the steep ascent, he procured from the Irish Parliament an act to remove the See to the town of Cashel. He then had the roof of the grand old pile stripped of its leaden covering and the lead sent to Dublin and sold; the Cathedral of St. Patrick was then abandoned to ruin by the elements. The adjoining churches were of great architectural beauty and were roofed with stone.

The massive walls of the grand old Cathedral of St. Patrick, with its castellated surroundings, with its suggestive memories, stand on the summit of huge limestone rocks, in the midst of one of the most luxurious regions in all Ireland, the "Golden Vale."[5]

The status of the Catholics of Ireland was set forth in a petition to George III, 1793, which recites: We are interdicted from all municipal stations, and the franchise of all guilds and corporations; which establishes a species of monopoly uniformly operating in our disfavor!

We may not found nor endow any university, college or school for the education of our children; and we are interdicted from obtaining degrees from the University of Dublin by the several charters and statutes now in force therein!

We are totally prohibited from keeping weapons for self-defense of our houses, families or persons. Any magistrate may compel a Catholic, be he peer or peasant, to come forward and convict himself of keeping arms for his defense; refusal to do so involves fine and imprisonment, the pillory and whipping!

No Catholic has his property secure. The law allows a son to turn Protestant and deprive his father of his real and personal property.

Catholics are excluded from all petit juries in civil actions, where one of the parties is a Protestant. And further excluded from trials of cases under the anti-Popery laws.

We can only serve on grand juries when there is not to be found a sufficiency of Protestants to complete the panel, which seldom if ever happens.

We pass over inferior grievances to state one great incapacity, which we claim to be a badge of unmerited ignominy. We are deprived of the elective franchise!

We are taxed without representation thereby, and otherwise humiliated and disgraced.[6]

[5] "Ireland, Its Scenery, Character," etc., by Mr. and Mrs. S. C. Hall. Vol. II., pp. 106, 107.

[6] Plowden, II., 275.

When England had recovered from her temporary embarrassment, after the loss of her American colonies, her statesmen found themselves face to face with the quasi independence of the Parliament of Ireland.

Then was commenced the work of the demoralization of that Parliament as a prelude to its destruction. Then originated the plans for wiping out the autonomy of the sister kingdom, by corrupting her legislature and incorporating Ireland into the English realm. England sent her Viceroys to Dublin tutored with her ultimate designs. Some of these officials, too honorable to play the part of corruptionists, resigned.

Through the means of the borough system, the suffrages of the patrons of these boroughs, either by money, by titles or by fat offices, were obtained. The most able, the most unscrupulous, as well as the most lavish, of the Vice Regal officials was Lord Castlereagh! He was given *carte blanche* power, and his success forms a melancholy chapter in Irish history.

The work the Irish patriots had accomplished for the freedom of the Irish nation was destroyed during the most shameful process recorded in constitutional history. Finally, during the first year of the nineteenth century, Castlereagh secured control of enough votes in both houses of the Parliament of Ireland to carry the act of Union by which the autonomy of the kingdom of Ireland was wiped out of existence. In the "Red List" will be found the names of the Irish members who could not be corrupted; in the Black List the shameful record of those who sold their votes and the price paid these recreants. It is an interesting study. It is consoling, however, to reflect that no Roman Catholic had a share in this disgraceful proceeding, and that very few of the names which appear in the "Black List" indicate pure Hibernian lineage.

The policy of the government and the efforts of their supporters was to foment fresh divisions and increase those that already existed among the various parties that composed the Irish community; nor were those arts practiced upon the Catholics only; the Orangemen were also applied to; but the Grand Orange Lodge of Ireland was induced to issue a circular to their brethren, advising the determination not to discuss the question of Union and recommending the same course to all other lodges. This was done at the suggestion, it was said, of Mr. Beresford and Mr. Verner, the principal leaders of that body. The result was that many of the lodges and the Orangemen throughout the country remained silent; and though sworn and bound by their oaths to uphold the constitution, *they beheld in silence its violation*. The Grand Lodge of the County of Antrim made a similar declaration; they declined to enter into the question, and

advised their brethren to adopt the same course. Notwithstanding this, thirty-two Orange Lodges in the counties of Down and Antrim alone agreed to resolutions disapproving of these instructions and declaring their right to discuss the question of Union.[7]

Many of these bodies assembled in various parts of Ireland in the months of February and March, 1800; though late in the field, they acted in a manner highly creditable, and adopted resolutions full of spirit and nationality. Examples are cited which indirectly disclose how, at the opening of the eighteenth century, all Ireland was permeated with organized bodies of men *opposed to the Catholic religion*, whose oaths made them the foes not only of the Catholic faith, but also of the four millions or more of Irish people professing that faith throughout the nation. The examples cited from among the thirty-two lodges referred to are designated by numbers only, without stating localities. Two read as follows:

Lodge No. 986. We are of opinion that a Legislative Union with Great Britain is a measure subversive of our happy constitution as established in 1782, and destructive to the trade and prosperity of Ireland.

Lodge No. 989. We declare in our opinion the proposed measure of an incorporate Union is destructive of our rights, liberties, trade and commerce. We will persevere, legally, in opposing so destructive a proposition.

Equally strong resolutions are cited by Grattan, from Lodges 596, 986, 641, 538, 497. The last quoted, from Lodge No. 651, reads as follows:

"That we see with unspeakable sorrow an attempt made to deprive Ireland of her constitution, of her trade; to seriously menace her present prosperity; to dwarf her national exertions and to reduce her to the degrading condition of a colony of England!"

In connection with the efforts of Castlereagh to obtain endorsement for the proposed act of Union, a study of the following record will be found interesting:

At a General Meeting of the Roman Catholics of the city of Waterford and its vicinity, 28 June, 1799, Peter St. Leger, Esq., in the chair:

The following were appointed a committee to prepare a Declaration on the measure of a Legislative Union: Rev. Dr. Thomas Hearn, Thomas Sherlock, Esq., Edward Shiel, Esq., Jeremiah Ryan, Esq., Thomas Hearn, Esq., M. D.

Resolved, That the following Declaration be adopted: The measure of a Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland having been recommended to the consideration of both his parliaments by our most gracious Sovereign, the common father of his people; we, his Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Catholics of the city of Waterford and its vicinity, have thought it incumbent upon us to make this public avowal of our sentiments on this important and interesting occasion.

We are firmly convinced that a complete and entire Union between Great Britain and Ireland, founded on equal and liberal principles, and on a sense of mutual interests and affections, is a measure of wisdom and expediency

[7] Grattan, Vol. V., p. 55.

for this kingdom, and will effectually promote the strength and prosperity of both, and we trust it will afford the surest means of allaying those unhappy distractions, and removing those penal exclusions on the score of religion, which have too long prevailed in this country, and by consolidating the resources of both kingdoms, oppose the most effectual resistance to the destructive projects of both foreign and domestic enemies.

Strongly impressed with these sentiments, we look forward with earnest anxiety to the moment when the two sister nations may be inseparably united in the full enjoyment of the blessings of a free constitution, in the support of the honor and dignity of his Majesty's crown, and in the preservation and advancement of the welfare and prosperity of the whole British empire. Resolved unanimously, That Lord Viscount Donoughmore, the sincere and attached friend of the Catholics of Ireland, be requested to communicate these our sentiments most respectfully to his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant.

[Signed.] PETER ST. LEGER, Chairman.

Dublin Castle, July 16, 1799.

My Lord: I am directed by my Lord Lieutenant to request your Lordship will have the goodness to express to the Roman Catholics of Waterford the satisfaction his Excellency feels from their declaration of the 20th of June, which they desired your Lordship to lay before him and which is so respectably signed.

The measure of a Legislative Union, upon just and liberal principles, between this kingdom and Great Britain is near his Excellency's heart; he is convinced that nothing will so effectually tend to bury the religious animosities in oblivion which have unhappily prevailed in this kingdom—to conciliate the affections of all his Majesty's subjects to the mild government under which they live—to increase the happiness and prosperity of Ireland—and to augment the power and stability of the British empire. I have the honor to be, with the truest esteem and regard, your Lordship's most obedient humble servant, CASTLEREAGH,

Lord Viscount Donoughmore.

Cork, 5th August, 1799.

My Lord: Having had this day the honour to receive from your Lordship, and to lay before my Lord Lieutenant, the unanimous address of the Roman Catholic inhabitants of the towns of Tiperary, Cahir and their vicinities, I am commanded by his Excellency to express to them, through your Lordship, the pleasure he derives from the strong expressions of loyalty to his Majesty therein mentioned.

His Excellency enjoins me to add that the primary aim of his administration is to consolidate the strength and resources of this kingdom with those of Great Britain, and by an irrevocable bond of amity and affection to fix the connection upon one solid and indissoluble basis. Persuaded that these essentials can only be effected by a Legislative Union, in which the interests, the property and happiness of the whole empire are materially involved, your Lordship will have the goodness to convey to the respectable Roman Catholics of the towns of Tiperary, Cahir and their vicinities the gratification their unanimous declaration in favor of this measure has afforded him.

I have the honor to be, etc., E. B. LITTLEHALES,

Lord Viscount Donoughmore.

The British Government had again sought to obtain an influence over the Roman Catholic hierarchy in the interest of British rule in Ireland. Having failed to wipe out the ancient faith of the Irish people, by the most cruel penal laws and by continued persecution, a policy of intrigue was commenced.[8]

As early as 1782 this government laid its plans to control the nomination of the Irish Catholic Bishops, offering for this privilege a mitigation of the application of the penal laws against the professors of the Catholic religion.[9] The intrigue in this direction having failed, it was deemed advisable to control the education of the Irish

[8] Grattan, Vol. V., p. 370.

[9] See extract from letter of Burke in Grattan, V., p. 371.

priesthood, and the college of Maynooth was founded, subsidized and its faculty organized for this purpose in 1795 by the Government.

In the meantime Lord Castlereagh, on the part of the Viceroy, formulated the plans by which it was intended to carry the act of Union, by which the Home Rule government of Ireland, with her Parliament, would be wiped out of existence.

Castlereagh proposed to the Catholic prelates that if they would cast their influence in favor of the measure and give England the right to veto the appointment of any Catholic bishop nominated, whose name was submitted, that might be deemed inimical to British interests, the Government, in consideration of such concessions, would by an act of Parliament endow the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland with yearly salaries as soon as the way seemed clear to do so.

It is doubtful if Lord Castlereagh, who was an unprincipled political trickster, had the remotest idea that he could induce the British Government to carry out the proposed plan of pensioning the Catholic priesthood of Ireland!

But as he was the prime minister of affairs under the Viceroy at Dublin Castle, credence was given by several prelates occupying high rank in the hierarchy of the Catholic Church in Ireland, who, in consideration, sought to influence public opinion in favor of the act of Union.

They soon found, however, that the great majority of the intelligent Roman Catholics of Ireland were decidedly opposed to the extinction of the Irish Parliament and of the amalgamation of the kingdom with England. The course taken by the prelates was as follows:

At a meeting of the Roman Catholic prelates held in Dublin on the 17th, 18th and 19th of January, 1799, to deliberate on a proposal from government for an independent provision for the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland under certain regulations not incompatible with their doctrines, discipline or just influence—it was admitted:

First. That a provision through government for the Roman Catholic clergy of this kingdom, competent and secured, ought to be thankfully accepted.

Second. That in the appointment of the prelates of the Roman Catholic religion to vacant sees within the kingdom, such interference of government as may enable it to be satisfied of the loyalty of the person to be appointed is just, and ought to be agreed to.

Third. That to give this principle its full operation without infringing the discipline of the Roman Catholic Church, or diminishing the religious influence which prelates of that Church ought justly to possess over their respective flocks, the following regulations seem necessary:

Fourth. In the vacancy of a see the clergy to recommend, as usual, a candidate to the prelates of the ecclesiastical province, who elect him or any other they may think more worthy, by a majority of suffrages—in the case of equality of suffrages, the presiding metropolitan to have a casting vote.

Fifth. The candidates so elected to be presented by the president (the chairman) of the election to government, which, within one month after such presentation, will transmit the name of said candidate, *if no objection be made against him,* for appointment to the Holy See, or return the said name to the president of the election for such transmission as may be agreed upon.

Sixth. If government have any proper objections against such candidates, the president of the election will be informed thereof within one month after presentation,

who in that case will convene the electors and proceed to the election of another candidate.

Seventh. Agreeably to the discipline of the Roman Catholic Church, these regulations can have no effect without the sanction of the Holy See, which sanction the Roman Catholic prelates of this kingdom shall, as soon as may be, use their endeavors to procure.

Eighth. The prelates are satisfied that the nomination of the parish priests, with a certificate of their having taken the oath of allegiance, be certified to government.

[Signed.]

Richard O'Reilly, R. C. A. B., Armagh (Primate).
J. J. Troy, R. C. A. B., Dublin.
Edward Dillon, R. C. A. B., Tuam.
Thomas Bray, R. C. A. B., Cashel.
P. J. Plunket, R. C. B., Meath.
F. Moylan, R. C. B., Cork.
Daniel Delaney, R. C. B., Kildare.
Edmund French, R. C. B., Elphin.
James Caulfield, R. C. B., Ferns.
John Cruise, R. C. B., Ardagh.

Dublin, 28 January, 1799.

The prelates, assembled to deliberate on a proposal from government of a provision for the clergy, have agreed that Most Rev. Dr. O'Reilly, Most Rev. Dr. Troy, Right Rev. Dr. Plunket, and such other of the prelates who *may be in town*, be commissioned to transact all business with government relative to the said proposal, under the substance of the regulations agreed on and subscribed by them.

This was a plausible and a tempting proposition to the Irish hierarchy, shrewdly extended by Lord Castlereagh. Ostensibly it meant the partial lifting from the impoverished people of all Ireland of the support of 2,500 Catholic priests.

But behind the scheme was the Government tutelage of the Bishops and priests of the kingdom, who were to be held under control of the Government, as are the Bishops and *curés* of France at the present day. Providentially this attempt was a failure.

It is probable that this action on the part of a moiety of the Irish hierarchy was influenced by the Most Rev. Dr. Troy, whose pro-British proclivity then, and subsequently, is a historical fact. He was *persona-grata* at the Castle. He had considerable influence at Rome, which resulted in the appointment of the two first bishops of New York.

He would have extended his influence more generally in the United States had not Bishop Carroll covered the ground and, with the coöperation of the Sulpitian doctors from Paris, built up the foundation of the American hierarchy.

At Rome Dr. Troy induced the Holy See to appoint Rev. Edmund Burke, an Irish priest, vicar general and missionary of all Western Canada. He was clothed with great jurisdiction, independent of the Canadian hierarchy.

Father Burke came to the frontier of Michigan at the time the American forces had acquired control of the north littoral of the boundary line between the River Raisin and Lake St. Clair.

In this region, which was all American, he made himself obnoxious by his pro-British proclivities; imagining his life was in danger, he

went to Nova Scotia, where he subsequently became bishop. Dr. Shea states he was a man of some ability.

But the veto measure had not been abandoned by the British Government.

It was a pet scheme of Castlereagh. Right Reverend Dr. Milner, an English Roman Catholic prelate, was induced to revive the scheme in 1808.

His efforts to obtain the suffrages of the Irish hierarchy in its favor were thwarted by the eminent Catholic historian, Dr. Lingard. In the month of September, 1809, the Catholic prelates of Ireland, at a meeting in Dublin, resolved:

That it was their decided opinion that it was inexpedient to introduce any alteration in the canonical mode hitherto observed in the nomination of the Roman Catholic Bishops, which mode long experience had proved to be unexceptionable, wise and salutary.

They followed this by another resolution pledging themselves to recommend only such persons as were of unimpeachable loyalty and peaceable conduct for the hierarchy. This was signed by twenty-three Bishops. There were only three dissentiests, namely, Most Rev. Dr. Troy and two other prelates who had signed the resolutions of 1799.

For this proceeding they received the thanks of the Catholics in various parts of Ireland, for the laity had in the meantime taken a decided part against the "Veto."[10] But Castlereagh, who was the father of the "Veto," had not given up his fight for the control of the Irish hierarchy. After the battle of Waterloo and the eclipse of Napeoleon he played his last stake and won, as he believed, his victory over the Irish Bishops.

He appealed to Cardinal Consalvi, Secretary of State of the Holy See, to coerce the obedience of the prelates of Ireland in favor of the proposition of the British Government. This Cardinal, considering that the rehabilitation of the Pontificate in the Roman States was due in a great measure to the power of England, knowing very little, it is presumed, about the Irish hierarchy, was only too willing to please Castlereagh. Moreover he (Consalvi) it was who, on the part of the Holy See, had negotiated with Napoleon the Concordat of 1801, which gave to the ruler of France the nomination of seventy or more Bishops and 40,000 *curés*. He could not see any great evil to the Catholic religion in Ireland by acceding to the wishes of the British Government. He accordingly on the part of the Holy See formulated an edict directed to the Irish hierarchy through the primate, commanding in general terms their adhesion, in fact, their submission, to the British Government the

[10] Grattan, V., p. 379.

right of the latter to object to the nomination of their Bishops. This was Castlereagh's last trump card. But the Irish prelates paid no attention to the edict of Cardinal Consalvi. The "Veto" question after thirty-three years' agitation was finally laid to rest.

The Confederacy of the United Irishmen was the greatest political organization leagued for a patriotic purpose known in modern history. The scandalous misrule of Lord Castlereagh during the last decade of the eighteenth century had inspired a majority of the leading men of the Irish nation to follow the example of the American colonies and to emancipate Ireland from British rule. The outbreak of the French Revolution warmed the hearts and encouraged the hopes of the Irish patriots. The ablest and purest minded men in the kingdom united to devise the mechanism of the organization, and so skillfully was their work accomplished that the elite of the educated classes and business men, regardless of religious affinity or of family connection, became members of the great Confederacy. Its centre was in Dublin, but it was powerful in Belfast and popular in all the cities and towns of the kingdom. Theobald Wolf Tone and others were sent to Paris to solicit aid from France and succeeded. But Almighty God had other designs for the future of the "Islands of Saints."

The fleets carrying the armies of the French Republic, which had they landed would have changed the destiny of Ireland and probably of England, too, were dispersed by storms off the Irish coast; and, except for a small contingent which was landed, returned to France. This great feature of the rebellion of the United Irishmen was apparently thwarted by the interference of Divine Providence.

The leaders of the Confederacy now had recourse to the half million of stalwart Irish peasants who had been enrolled and drilled in nocturnal exercises, but who were without arms and competent officers. But in the meantime the secret of the Confederacy, the names of its leaders in Dublin and elsewhere and of its designs had been sold by a Dublin merchant named Reynolds to Lord Castlereagh. This recreant, with the large amount of his blood money, hastily left the kingdom. His purchaser now had the whole framework of the Confederacy of the United Irishmen at his disposal. It is said he was cold-blooded enough to allow the patriots to mature their plans, so that while Ireland was in the throes of an abortive rebellion he could carry through the Irish Parliament the infamous Act of Union, by which Ireland with her independent autonomy was absorbed into the English Commonwealth.

In the meantime troops were rushed over to Ireland. A contingent of brutal Hessian soldiers were added to the red coats, while all the Orange militia that could be relied upon were uni-

formed, armed and enrolled in regiments. Then Castlereagh let the havoc commence. What followed was not a civil war; it had more of the features of a brutal race war, in which the Irish peasants, "at length," prepared by the sufferings and indignities of centuries, listened with sanguine or desperate credulity to the counsel which reminded them of their strength and directed them to employ it in one furious effort which, whether it failed or prospered, could not embitter their condition. "The spirit of the Government," continues William Henry Curran in his father's biography, "found a ready and a fatal coöperation in the gentry of the land. Never was there a class of men less amenable to the lessons of experience.

Others filled their places who developed the plan of buying, Adversity, the great instructor of the wise, brought to them all the afflictions without their antidote. Every fierce, inveterate resentment of the race lineally descended with the title deeds from the father to the son. Year after year the landlord's house was fired, his stock was plundered, his rent unpaid, his land a waste, and each succeeding year he was seen effecting his escape through scenes of turbulence and danger, from his estate to the capital, to make his periodical complaint of his sufferings and to give the minister another vote for their continuance. "The Irish landlord," continues Mr. Curran, "of the last century was the great inciter to insurrection. With a nominal superiority of rank and education he was in every ferocious propensity upon a level with the degraded dependants whom he affected to contemn and whose passions he vainly labored to control, because he had never set them the example of controlling his own. Finding his efforts abortive, he next vindictively debased them, and the consequence was that in a little time he shared the same fate with his victims. The condition of Ireland during the eighteenth century affords a striking and melancholy example of the certain retribution with which a system of misrule will visit those who so mistake their own interests as to give it their support. An inconsiderable order or a single sect may (however unjustly) be degraded with impunity; but the degradation of the mass of a nation will inevitably recoil upon its oppressors. The consequences may not always be visible in formidable acts of force, but there is a silent and unerring retaliation in the effects upon morals and manners by which the tyrant is made eventually to atone for his crimes. In highly polished states they may be observed descending from the higher to the inferior ranks. The courtesy and humanity of the old French peer were found to give a tinge to the conversation of the mechanic. In uncivilized communities the progress is the reverse; the rudeness of the boor will ascend and taint the master. The latter was the case in Ireland. The Irish

peasant in his intercourse with his superiors saw nothing of which the imitation could soften and improve him. The gentry, although conscious that their religion and the violent means by which so many of them had acquired their properties excited the suspicion and aversion of those below them, resorted to every infallible method of confirming these hostile impressions.

Instead of endeavoring to eradicate them by mildness and protection, they insulted and oppressed. Every district presented scenes of turbulent contention in which the haughty lord lost whatever dignity he had possessed and finally became infected with the barbarous passions and manners of the vassals whom he had disdained to civilize till he required as much to be civilized himself.[11]

The supreme struggle was short, while the suppression of the rebellion was attended with great slaughter and devastation. The number of the patriots who perished in conflict, on the scaffold or who were exiled exceeded 50,000. The loss of life on the part of the English side reached 20,000.

During the first months of the conflict sixty-nine Roman Catholic churches were raided and destroyed. In the counties of Dublin, Ferns and Wexford the aggregate was fifty-nine, while in other counties it was ten, while the houses of the priests, school buildings and parish dependencies exceeding these numbers were either ruined or demolished. These facts are on record, for the Government was obliged to make good the respective losses. But what scenes of horror had ensued! The social condition of the Roman Catholics during the last year of the eighteenth century was lamentable. The cities, towns and villages were garrisoned mostly by Orange militiamen, while among the county sheriffs and other local officials were to be found some of the most brutal "No Popery" haters in the British Empire.[12]

Although, remarks the conservative historian Plowden, by no official act were the picketings, stranglings, floggings and torturings to extort confessions justified or sanctioned, yet it is universally known that under the very eye of government, *and with more than their tacit permission*, were these outrages practised, in defiance of the constitution as admitted by all, in defiance of humanity and policy as maintained by most men.

In Beresford's Riding House, Sandy's Prevot, the Old Custom House, the Royal Exchange, some of the barracks and other places in Dublin there were daily, hourly notorious exhibitions of these

11 "The Life of the Right Honorable John Philpot Curran," by his son, William Henry Curran, with additions and notes by R. Shelton Mackenzie, D. C. L. 244 et. seq.

12 Plowden, II., p. 299.

torturings, as there also were in almost every town, village or hamlet throughout the kingdom in which troops were quartered. An example is recorded when the sheriff of Clonmel ordered a Catholic citizen of standing and of means *to be given 500 lashes*, and kept him confined three days, so that his wounds could not receive attention. His offense was that a letter in French of innocent purport was found in his possession.[13]

While Catholic Ireland was still bleeding; while the smoke of devastation of churches and peasants' homes still obscured the atmosphere; while torturing the members of prominent Catholic families was of daily occurrence; while the prisons were filled with accused patriots too numerous to face the courts; while the "British guillotine," the hangman's rope, consigned the unfortunate victims condemned by biased judges and packed juries to eternity on the scaffold, Lord Castlereagh was busy formulating his plans for extinguishing constitutional liberty in Ireland by passing an act of Union with England. He found that money down, titles of nobility, salaried offices of every kind, including Bishops, might be employed in purchasing enough votes in the Irish House of Parliament to carry the act of Union.

The most distinguished of the Protestant talent in the House fought the measure step by tep. Their eloquent speeches fell lifeless upon the minds of men who had been corrupted. The *Red List* gives the names of the incorruptible patriots of Ireland, while the *Black List* gives the names, together with the price paid by Castlereagh.

THE ORIGINAL RED LIST.

Of the Members of the Irish House of Commons who voted against the Union in 1799 and 1800:

Acheson, Hon. A., son of Lord Gosford.
Alcock, William C., County Wexford.
Archdall, Mervyn, County Fermanagh.
Armstrong, William H., refused all government offers.
Burrowes, Peter, subsequently Judge.
Ball, John, member for Drogheda; incorruptible.
Ball, Charles, brother of the above.
Barrington, Sir Jonah, Judge in admiralty.
Bushe, Charles, afterwards Chief Justice.
Blakeney, William.
Burton, William.
Brooke, Henry V.
Balfour, Blaney.
Babbington, David, related to Lord Belmore.
Barry, Col. I. Maxwell, Lord Farnham.
Corry, Viscount, Lord Belmore, vigorous opponent.
Clements, Lord, subsequently Lord Leitrim.
Cole, Hon. Lowry, a general.
Caulfield, Lord, subsequently Earl of Charlemont.
Coddington, Henry.
Crookshank, George.

[13] Plowden, II., 711 et. seq.

Daly, Dennis B.
Dalway, Noah.
Dawson, Arthur.
Dawson, Richard.
Dobbs, Francis, famous author.
Egan, Francis, King's Counsel.
Edgeworth, Richard L.
Evans, George.
Freke, Sir John, subsequently Lord Carberry.
Falkiner, Frederick.
Fitzgerald, Right Hon. J.
Foster, Right Hon. J., Speaker of the House.
Foster, Hon. Thomas.
Gorges, Hamilton, incorruptible, though poor.
Grattan, Henry.
Goold, Thomas.
Hamilton, Hans.
Hardman, Edward.
Hardy, Francis, author.
Hoare, Sir Joseph.
Hoare, Edward, very old and stone blind.
Hoare, Hume.
Hoare, Bartholomew, King's Counsel.
Hamilton, Alexander, King's Counsel.
Hamilton, Hon. A. C.
Irwin, Henry.
King, Charles.
King, Gilbert.
King, Hon. Robert.
King, Major.
King, Right Hon. Henry.
Kingsborough, Lord, Earl of Kingston.
Knox, Hon. George.
Lambert, Gustavus.
Latouche, David, Jr., banker.
Latouche, John, Sr., banker.
Latouche, John, Jr., banker.
Latouche, Robert, banker.
Lee, Edward.
Leighton, Sir Thomas, Baronet, banker.
Leslie, Charles Powell.
Maxwell, Lord.
Macartney, Sir J., Baronet.
Montgomery, Alexander.
Moore, Arthur.
Moore, John.
Mathew, Lord, Earl of Landaff.
Mahon, Thomas.
Metge, John.
Newenham, Thomas, author.
O'Brien, Sir Edward, Clare County.
O'Callaghan, Hon. W.
O'Donnell, James Moore.
O'Donnell, Colonel Hugh.
Ogle, Right Hon. George.
Osborn, Henry.
Parnell, Henry.
Parnell, Sir John, Chancellor of the Exchequer, dismissed for his vote by Castlereagh.
Parsons, Sir Lawrence, Earl of Rosse.
Plunket, Lord W. C.
Ponsonby, George, subsequently Lord Ponsonby.
Ponsonby, James B., subsequently Lord Ponsonby.
Ponsonby, Right Hon., subsequently Lord Chancellor.
Ponsonby, General W., killed at Waterloo.
Power, Richard.
Preston, Joseph.
Rochfort, John S.
Reilly, William E.
Richardson, Sir William.
Ruxton, Charles.
Ruxton, William P.
Sauderson, Francis.
Savage, Francis.

Saurin, Right Hon. William, subsequently Attorney General.
Saint George, Sir R., Baronet.
Shaw, Robert, banker.
Skeffington, Hon. W. J.
Stewart, Henry.
Stewart, James.
Smyth, William.
Sneyd, Nathaniel.
Synge, Francis.
Taylor, John.
Taylor, Hon. R.
Tighe, Henry.
Tighe, John.
Townsend, Thomas.
Vereker, later Lord Gort.
Waller, John.
Westby, Nicholas.
Whaley, Thomas.
Wolfe, Colonel John, deprived of his commission.
Wynne, Owen.

ORIGINAL BLACK LIST.

Those who voted for the Union:

Aldridge, R., imported for the purpose.
Alexander, Henry. His own brother made a bishop and himself Colonial Secretary Cape of Good Hope.
Archdall, Richard, made a commissioner.
Bailey, William, similar reward.
Beresford, Right Hon. J., First Commissioner of Revenue, brother-in-law of Lord Clare.
Beresford, J., Junior, made Lord Decies.
Beresford, Marcus, made Colonel in the army.
Bingham, J., made a peer and paid $115,000, with the title of Lord Clanmorris.
Blake, Joseph H., created Lord Wallscourt, etc.
Blackwood, Sir J. J., created Lord Dufferin.
Blaquiere, Sir John, offices and pensions and created Lord de Blaquiere.
Bagwell, John, Sr.,
Bagwell, John, Jr.,
Father and son, lucrative rewards.
Botet, Anthony, made a commissioner, with $400 a year.
Burton, Colonel, commission in army.
Butler, Sir Richard, purchased on private terms.
Boyle, Lord, son of Lord Shannon. Father and son paid half a million dollars for seats and parliamentary boroughs.
Brown, Right Hon. D., Lord Sligo's brother.
Bruce, Stewart, official in Dublin Castle, made a Baronet.
Burdet, George, a commissioner with $2,500 a year.
Bunbury, George, a similar reward.
Browne, Arthur, renegaded, died soon afterwards.
Cane, James, pensioned for his vote.
Casey, Thomas, commissionership and salary.
Castlereagh, the Irish Minister.
Cavendish, George, and father, Sir Henry, well provided with salaried positions.
Chinnery, Sir R., lucrative office.
Cope, Colonel C., fat position.
Cooke, made under secretary at Castle.
Coote, Charles H., made Lord Castlecoote and given $37,500 for his vote.
Correy, Right Hon. Isaac, made Chancellor of the Exchequer, vice Sir John Parnell.
Cotter, Sir John, vote purchased, terms private.
Cotter, Richard, terms private.
Creighton, Hon. H. } Votes purchased for
Creighton, Hon. J. } money consideration, terms private.
Craddock, General, created Lord Howden, with higher military rank.
Crosby, James, made a colonel, with pecuniary reward for his vote.
Crosbie, W. A., high office and salary.
Cuppe, natural son of Mr. Cuppe, who was created Lord Tyrawley.
Dunne, General, rewarded by high office.
Elliott, G., Secretary at the Castle.

Eustace, General, given a regiment.
Fitzgerald, Lord Charles, Duke of Leinster's brother, a pension and a peerage; he was a naval officer of no repute.
Fergusson, Mr. A., given an office, $2,500 a year, and made a baronet.
Fortescue, Sir C., a lucrative office.
Forward, Right Hon. W., Lord Wicklow's brother.
Fox, Luke, related to Lord Ely, made a judge.
Fortescue, William, pension $15,000 a year.
Galbraith, J., made a baronet.
Grady, Henry D., made counsel to Commissioners.
Hare, Richard, put two members into Parliament, created Lord Ennismore for their votes.
Hare, William, son of the above.
Hatton, George, made commissary of stamps.
Handcock, William, made a peer, under scandalous circumstances.
Heniker, Colonel B., made a Lord and paid $17,500.
Hobson, John, lucrative office.
Holmes, Peter, made Commissioner of Stamps.
Howard, Hugh, Lord Wicklow's brother, made Postmaster General, large salary.
Hutchinson, Hon. J., created Lord Hutchinson and made a general.
Jackson, Colonel George, given a regiment.
Jackson, brother of above, made a general.
Jepson, Denham, lucrative appointment.
Jocelyn, Hon. G., high military rank and his brother made Bishop of Lismore.
Johnson, Robert, made a judge.
Johnson, William, elected to Parliament by Lord Castlereagh, appointed Judge.
Jones, Theophilus, made collector of Dublin.
Jones, William, appointed colonel.
Keane, John, pensioned.
Kearney, James, attorney of Lord Clifton, an office.
Kemmis, Henry, son of Crown Solicitor.
Keatinge, Colonel.
Knott, William, made Commissioner, $4,000 a year.
Knox, Andrew, Lord Abercorn's influence.
Lake, General, an Englishman, elected by Lord Castlereagh to vote for the Union.
Langrishe, Right Hon. Sir Hercules, an office and $75,000 in money for his patronage.
Latouche, Right Hon. David, banker.
Lindsay, T., paid $7,500 for his patronage.
Lindsay, T., son of above, paid $7,500 and given an office at the Castle.
Longfield, T., created Lord Longueville.
Longfield, Captain J., a lucrative office.
Loftus, Lord, son of Lord Ely, Postmaster General. Father and son received $150,000.
Loftus, General, relative of above, a regiment.
McNamara, Francis, a pension paid by Lord Castlereagh.
Mahon, Ross, several places.
Martin, Richard, Commissioner of Stamps.
Massey, H. D., received $20,000 for his vote.
Mason, Right Hon. Monk, Commissioner of Revenue.
Mason, Thomas.
McNaughton, A. E., made Lord of the Treasury.
Moore, Stephen, a postmaster at will.
Moore, N. M.
Morris, Right Hon. Lodge, created a peer.
McClelland, James, Baron of the Exchequer.
McDonnel, Colonel C. M., Commissioner, $2,500 a year.
McGennis, Richard, a similar position.
Musgrave, Sir R., Receivership, $6,000 a year.
Nesbit, Thomas, pensioner at will.
Newcommen, Sir William G., vote purchased by a peerage for his wife.
Neville, Richard, Teller of the Exchequer.
Odell, William, a regiment and made Lord of the Treasury.
Ormsby, C. M., Council Commissioner.
Packenham, Admiral, Master of the Ordnance.
Packenham, Colonel, made a general (brother of above) and killed at New Orleans in battle against the Americans, commanded by his fellow-countryman, Andrew Jackson, subsequently President.
Pensfather, R.
Prendergast, T., he and his brother given offices of $2,500 a year.

Prittie, H. S., created Lord Dunally.
Quin, Sir Richard, created a Lord.
Roche, Sir Boyle, gentleman usher at the Castle.
Rowley, Hon. C., sold his vote for a high office.
Rutledge, R.
Sandford, H. M., created Lord Mount Sandford.
Savage, James.
Sharkey, Richard, appointed a county judge.
Skeffington, Hon. H., a position and $37,500 in money for his patronage.
Smith, William, a barrister, appointed a Baron of the Exchequer.
Stanley, Edmond, made Commissioner of Accounts.
Staples, John.
Stannus, Thomas, renegaded.
Stewart, John, created a baronet and appointed Attorney General.
Stratton, John.
Stratford, Hon. B., paid $37,500 compensation.
Stratford, Hon. J., brother of above, made Paymaster of Foreign Forces, $6,000 a year, and paid $37,500 compensation.
Toler, Right Hon. John, Attorney General, made Chief Justice and a Peer.
Talbot, Richard.
Trench, Frederick, Commissioner of Works.
Trench, Charles, Commissioner of Inland Navigation, a new office created by Lord Cornwallis for reward.
Trench, Hon. R., a barrister, created a peer and made an ambassador.
Tottenham, Charles, in office.
Tottenham, P., cousin of Lord Ely, compensated for patronage.
Tyrone, Lord, proposed the Union in Parliament, *and got 104 offices in the gift of his family!*
Townsend, John, Commissioner.
Tighe, Robert, Commissioner of Barracks.
Uniac, Robert, related to Lord Clare, made a Commissioner.
Verner, James, called the "Prince of Orange."
Vandeleur, I. D., commissionership for himself and his brother made a judge.
Weymiss, Colonel, Collector of Kilkenny.
Westenra, Henry, father of Lord Rossmore, but the reverse of him in politics.

This *Black List* ends the disgraceful history of the destruction of the Parliament of Ireland by Lord Castlereagh.

It was the unfortunate country herself which had to bear the burden of the lavish use of money, the entail of the additions to the peerage and baronetage and the fat salaries of the bishops, judges, officers without number and places expressly made as a reward for votes. All of which was added to the bonded debt of Ireland. We might recall the words of Grattan "that this Constitutional Parliament was a Godlike work and required fiends to destroy it!"

RICHARD R. ELLIOTT.

THE TEACHING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT AND OF THE CHURCH REGARDING DIVORCE.

THE Catholic Church has always shown herself exceeding jealous of the sacredness of the matrimonial bond, and especially in these latter days her legislation on the subject of matrimony affords a striking contrast to the laxity of sectarian churches and to the deplorable ease with which divorces can now be obtained in the secular courts.

The Council of Trent may be taken as affording an index of the general teaching of the Church on the point. "If any one asserts that the Church errs or has erred when she teaches or has taught according to the doctrine of the Gospel and of the Apostle that the bond of matrimony cannot be dissolved by reason of the adultery of one of two married persons; and that neither of them, not even the innocent party who has not committed adultery, can marry again during the lifetime of the other; and that both he who puts away his adulterous wife and marries another commits adultery, as well also as the wife who leaves her husband by reason of his adultery—let him be anathema."

And in this decree the Council of Trent is but repeating the seventeenth canon of the Council of Mileris held under Pope Innocent I. in the year 416. "According to the doctrine of the Gospel and of the Apostle let neither the husband who is put away by his wife, nor the wife who is put away by her husband marry another, but let them remain as they are or be reconciled to one another."

These two decrees, separated from one another by a distance of eleven hundred years, bear witness to the unchanging nature of the Church's doctrine. But while the Church has thus stereotyped her teaching, a change has come over the non-Catholic world and divorce has become merely a question of money. At the same time it would be wrong to suppose that it was merely the secular courts which were lenient on the subject. Christian teachers, in spite of one or two earnest protests, all seem to hold that there are certain things which give a right to a divorce and that the remarriage of those who have been divorced from wife or husband is often perfectly legitimate and in full accord with Christian teaching. Disregarding all ecclesiastical tradition, they appeal to the Gospel as interpreted by nineteenth and twentieth century ideals, and they maintain that Christ Himself as well as the Apostle sanctioned their lax views regarding the marriage bond.

It may be worth our while then to examine those passages of the New Testament which touch upon the question.

The first declaration of Our Blessed Lord on the subject of divorce is found in the sermon on the mount:

> And it hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a bill of divorce.
> But I say to you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, excepting the cause of fornication, maketh her to commit adultery; and he that shall marry her that is put away, committeth adultery.—S. Matth. v., 31-32.

And the same doctrine is given in a more extended form at a later period of His public ministry:

> And there came to him the Pharisees tempting him, and saying: Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?
> Who answering, said to them: Have ye not read, that he who made man from the beginning, Made them male and female? And he said:
> For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they two shall be in one flesh.
> Therefore now they are not two, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder.
> They say to him: Why then did Moses command to give a bill of divorce, and to put away?
> He said to them: Because Moses by reason of the hardness of your heart permitted you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so.
> And I say to you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and he that shall marry her that is put away, committeth adultery.

Now at first sight we might be inclined to feel that there was something to be said in favor of the non-Catholic interpretation of these words, for a clause seems to be inserted by Our Lord on purpose to afford a loophole for divorce.

Cardinal Cajetan's commentary on the passage is: "This text clearly makes an adulterer to be one who does these two things—namely, put away a wife who has not committed fornication and then marry another. And the reason why this is adultery is clearly that the marriage bond between himself and the wife he has put away still holds; but the text says nothing about the case where a man puts away a guilty wife and marries another. And if you urge that Our Lord's words cannot be superfluous and that by excepting fornication they signify a different solution when other causes exist, then I must confess that this is true; and if you further insist that this difference can only be that he who puts away a *guilty* wife and marries another does not commit adultery, then I answer that the text, according to the plain meaning of the letter, does mean that; but since I dared not oppose myself to the whole flood of the Church's Doctors and Judges I therefore said above that the text said nothing about the case of a man who put away a guilty wife. Consequently I gather from this law of Our Lord Jesus Christ that it *is* lawful for a man to put away his wife if she be guilty, and that he can then marry another—saving always any contrary definition of the Church."

This is plain, straightforward and unflinching exegesis, and

Cardinal Cajetan's authority is very great. At the same time an examination of the text may lead us to another conclusion:

And there came to him the Pharisees tempting him, and saying: Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?

This was their question and true exegesis demands that we interpret the answer in the light of the question. By the expression "for every cause," which we are hardly justified in rendering "for any cause," they imply that there were, according to their ideas, certain causes which justified such a putting away; thus we are told that though Rabbi Schammai insisted that no man should divorce his wife except in the case of adultery, Hillel, his adversary and the teacher of Gamaliel, allowed divorce if the wife "spoiled the roast" or proved an indifferent cook! They further imply a second question, "And if a man can put away his wife can he marry again?"

Our Lord's answer contains three distinct points. He first of all lays down the absolute indissolubility of marriage:

Who answering said to them: Have ye not read, that he who made man from the beginning, Made them male and female? And he said:
For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they two shall be in one flesh.
Therefore now they are not two, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder.

Nothing could be more positive; it seems to preclude all exception. "No human agent, no human cause can be sufficient to put them asunder." And his questioners felt this so strongly that they at once urged the fact that Moses allowed them divorce:

They say to him: Why then did Moses command to give a bill of divorce, and to put away?

Our Lord answers that this concession was only temporary and, so to speak, coming from Moses:

He saith to them: Because Moses by reason of the hardness of your heart permitted you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it was not so.

But it is now to be abrogated in favor of the original Divine precept, for "a greater than Solomon is here;" nay, a greater than Moses:

But I say to you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and he that shall marry her that is put away, committeth adultery.

In this most solemn piece of legislation the clause "except it be for fornication" constitutes the difficulty. If we compare the parallel passages in S. Mark x., 11-12, and S. Luke xvi., 18, we find that they omit it. This omission, however, is insufficient ground for questioning its genuineness in S. Matthew. The question then is as to the relationship of that clause to the rest of the verse, if it must be

taken with the clause "and shall marry another," and thus declares the two necessary conditions for adultery, so that only he who puts away an innocent wife and marries another is guilty of adultery, then we have no alternative but to admit Cajetan's view that Our Lord implied that separation from an unfaithful wife was a dissolution of the marriage bond. There is, however, no necessity whatever to take it with the clause about marrying another; it may perfectly well be a parenthesis qualifying only the words: "Whosoever shall put away his wife." And that this is really the meaning intended may be gathered, as we said above, from the purport of their question.

They asked an explicit question: "Was it lawful to divorce their wives?" And to this Our Lord gives an explicit answer: "Yes, but only because of her unfaithfulness." But they implied a far more delicate question and one which was indeed the motive of the other: "And if they could put away their wives were they free to marry again?" And to this Our Lord gives a clear and decided answer, making no distinction whatever between her guilt or innocence: "Whosoever shall put away his wife . . . and marry another committeth adultery, and he that shall marry her that is put away committeth adultery."

Is this treatment of the text justified? The way in which the disciples understood it shows that it is so.

His disciples say unto him: If the case of a man with his wife be so, it is not expedient to marry.

Would they have said this if they had understood Our Lord to mean that the wife's infidelity enabled them to leave her and marry again? And note that Our Lord does not correct their view.

Who said to them: All men take not this word, but they to whom it is given.

And in accordance with this view, S. Thomas asks* whether divorcing his wife a man can marry another, and he answers that nothing which supervenes upon matrimony can dissolve the bond. He then proposes the objection: "But we read in S. Matthew xix., 9: *'Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery;'* whence it seems that if a man put away his wife *because of fornication* and marrieth another he does not commit adultery, and his second marriage will be a true one." His answer is brief "that exception given in the Lord's words refers to the dismissal of the wife, and therefore the objection arises from a mistaken rendering (of the text)."

It would make too great a demand upon our space to transcribe S. Augustine's analysis of S. Matthew xix., 9, but in his treatise "de

* Suppl. 62, 5, ad. 4m.

conjugiis adulterinis" he answers the question of Politianus, who wished to interpret the passage in the sense demanded by Cajetan. Politianus had urged that the words of S. Paul:

> But to them that are married, not I, but the Lord commandeth, that the wife depart not from her husband.
> And if she depart, that she remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband. And let not the husband put away his wife.—I. Cor. vii., 10-11.

meant that either husband or wife were at liberty to insist upon separation whenever they pleased, but that if they did so, both must remain unmarried. It is interesting then to note that S. Augustine decides the meaning of the expression "if she depart" by the words of Our Lord:

> And I say to you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and he that shall marry her that is put away, committeth adultery.

"If she depart," he argues, "for fornication," *i. e.*, of her husband, the only cause of separation which the Lord allowed. And he goes on to say that it is impossible to argue from the words of the text that whoever puts away his wife because of her fornication, and marries another, is not guilty of adultery. This, he says, is manifestly a perversion of the text, because the Lord would be conceding to the husband a liberty which S. Paul in the words given above refuses to the wife, whereas the same Apostle, with those very words of Our Lord in his mind, claims absolute equality for husband and wife in this matter:

> The wife hath not power of her own body: but the husband. And in like manner the husband also hath not power of his own body: but the wife.—I. Cor. vii., 4.

Thus it was decreed in the Council of Gangres, held in the time of Pope Silvester I., that: "If any woman leaveth her husband, and wishes to so depart because she abhorreth marriage, let her be anathema."

Again, argues the saint, it would be an unfair inference from the words of S. James:

> To him therefore who knoweth to do good, and doth it not, to him it is sin.—I. Cor. iv., 17.

if we concluded "therefore he who knoweth not to do good, and doth it not, to him it is no sin;" so similarly is it illegitimate to argue as Politianus has done from Our Lord's own words.

If you ask then why the Lord used so ambiguous an expression, I answer that inasmuch as it would be a more grievous sin to put away an innocent wife and marry another than to put away a guilty wife and marry another, the Lord by condemning the less heinous act as adulterous thereby convicts the more heinous crime of adultery.

And lastly we are bound to explain an ambiguous passage in the Gospels by less ambiguous parallels, but, as we have pointed out above, S. Mark and S. Luke do not insert the crucial clause "except it be for fornication," and they thus leave no doubt as to the precise meaning intended by Our Blessed Lord.

It is perfectly clear then from the foregoing that according to S. Augustine adultery does not dissolve the bond of marriage, though it gives the innocent party a right to a separation, and this he explicitly states later on. He quotes S. Paul to the Romans:

> For the woman that hath an husband, whilst her husband liveth is bound to the law. But if her husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband.

"If then," he argues, "she is 'bound as long as her husband liveth,' nothing but her husband's death can release her from that bond. But if, as you (Politianus) say, fornication is equivalent to death, then a woman who commits fornication becomes free; but see what follows, any man who then marries her is free from the charge of adultery!"

Perhaps the most perverse interpretation of Our Lord's words in the sermon on the mount:

> And it hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a bill of divorce.
> But I say to you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, excepting the cause of fornication, maketh her to commit adultery: and he that shall marry her that is put away, committeth adultery.

is that furnished by Tertullian in his tenth book against Marcion: "I say," he writes, "that Christ only conditionally prohibits divorce on the supposition namely that a man puts away his wife precisely in order to marry another. 'Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another has committed adultery; and he who marrieth her that is put away by her husband equally committeth adultery,' both of them of course for the same reason she has been put away, namely, for that very object which will not justify such a dismissal, namely, that her husband may marry another; the Lord considers her who is unjustly put away as not put away at all, and the marriage still holds. . . . But to prohibit a thing on certain grounds only is not to entirely prohibit it, and what He did not entirely prohibit He permitted."

We need hardly comment on this, save only to remark the contrast between the above treatment of the passage and the evenly balanced discussion of it by S. Augustine.

But though S. Augustine speaks so decidedly upon this point he yet fully appreciated the difficulty of the passage in S. Matthew. Thus he remarks in his treatise "de Fide et Operibus," cap. 19: "A man who puts away his wife because she is unfaithful, and who

then marries another, ought not perhaps to be put on a par with men who divorce an innocent wife and then marry again. As to the question whether a man who is perfectly justified in putting away his wife because of her adultery becomes himself an adulterer if he marry another, the Sacred Scriptures are so obscure that as far as I can see it is quite excusable to misunderstand them."

And as an instance of the want of unanimity on the question, S. Ambrose in his commentary on I. Cor. vii., "to them that are married not I, but the Lord commandeth . . . let not the husband put away his wife," remarks: "He supposes of course 'except for the cause of fornication,' and therefore he did not add, as he did in the case of the woman, 'and if he depart let him remain unmarried,' for the man is allowed to marry another wife if he has put away his former wife because of her infidelity, since the man is not so strictly bound by the law as the woman, 'for the man is the head of the woman.'" A little further on S. Ambrose expressly denies the woman's right to marry again if she has been compelled to leave her husband because of his infidelity.

It should be noted that both these points have been decided by the Council of Trent. Adultery does not dissolve marriage, and both husband and wife have equal rights in wedlock, as S. Augustine points out so clearly.

So similarly Rabanus Maurus and S. Jerome clearly hold that the bond of matrimony is not annulled by the adultery of one party. Indeed S. Jerome, Ep. 77, ad Ocenanum, dwells at some length upon the mistake made on this point by Fabiola, who felt herself forced to leave her husband because of his atrociously wicked life. She then married again in perfectly good faith, but when told of her error she did condign penance.

We must be careful, however, not to push too far the canon of the Council of Trent quoted above. The Church has never defined that the bond of matrimony *cannot* be dissolved by the adultery of one party. She has defined only that the Church cannot err in teaching that it *is* not to be so dissolved. The schismatic Greeks still maintain that adultery renders the marriage null, but in view of the Church's declarations their opinion must at least be condemned as "haeresi proxima."

It should at the same time be pointed out that the Church herself has only by slow degrees arrived at unanimity on this question. Thus in striking contrast to the decrees of Trent and Mileris quoted above we notice that the Council of Granada held in the year 305 enacts that "women who have left their husbands for no cause and have married others are not to receive Communion even at the point of death." (Can. viii.) This seems to at least imply that

there were certain causes justifying a second marriage even during their first husband's lifetime.

Yet on the other hand Pope Zachary I. declared that if a man sinned with his sister-in-law, his wife should put him away and marry again if unable to live unmarried. This decree is given in Gratian, where we also find another decree attributed to the Council of Granada, by which a husband is free to marry again if his wife sin with her brother-in-law. We find similar enactments in the Council of Tribur, Can. xl., held in the year 895. They clearly show that in the eyes of many adultery dissolved the bond of marriage and that the innocent party was free to contract again if he or she so willed. We said that the above decree was "attributed" to the Council of Granada because it is so by Gratian, but we fail to find it among the "Acta" of that Council. On the contrary, the Ninth Canon runs: "The Christian woman who has left her husband by reason of his adultery and wishes to marry another, is to be prohibited from so doing, and if she do marry, let her not be admitted to Communion until the death of her first husband unless sickness should necessitate it."

With S. Augustine we may group S. Chrysostom, Euthymius and Theophylact who follow, S. Hilary and Chromatius. They all agree that the husband has the absolute right, as also the wife, to repudiate his or her adulterous partner, but they allow no remarriage of either of the separated parties during the lifetime of the other.

Cajetan, as we have seen, told the probable that a complete divorce was intended by Our Lord's words on the subject, but this opinion he held subject to the Church's decision and as a possibility only.

The Bishops of Origen's day and Pope Zachary, whom we cited above, permitted such complete divorces and subsequent marriages of the separated parties.

While lastly S. Ambrose and Tertullian not merely concede such permissions, but regard them as the innocent party's due.

Hugh Pope, O. P.

Rugely, England.

Scientific Chronicle.

RADIUM EMANATIONS.

Among the physicists who are actively investigating the peculiar emanations from radium, polonium and other substances, many are giving attention to the most interesting of all the questions involved in the study of these emanations, namely, their origin. These radiations produce thermal, chemical and luminous effects without suffering any apparent diminution. Prominent among the explanations advanced to explain the origin of such emanations we may mention two. The first suggests that the emanations are produced by a chemical transformation in the radiating substance. This explanation simply puts radium, thorium and the other radio-active bodies in the category of fuels, and we should soon be able to point out the limit of the emanations from a given amount of radium, as we are able to determine the heat equivalent of a given amount of coal.

The second explanation is proposed by Sir William Crookes and considers radio-active substances merely as transformers of molecular energy preëxisting in the atmosphere. Should this explanation prove to be the true one, then are we on the verge of entering a field as yet unknown to scientific research. While these theoretical questions remain as yet undetermined, practical applications are made of these emanations and new uses are suggested.

The germicidal action of the emanations from radium seems to be clearly established by well authenticated and successful results in the treatment of cancer, when the malady is external. When carelessly applied severe inflammation of the skin exposed to the emanations may be the result, but when properly applied they seem to have a selective action, destroying diseased tissue only and causing reparative action in such cases as lupus and external malignant growths like cancer. A clear explanation of the mode of action of these emanations has not yet been given. By some it is supposed to be a germicidal action, while others hold that an inflammatory reaction is set up whereby the scavenger cells of the body accumulate, attack and destroy the morbid tissues.

Whatever may be the explanation the results are at least hopeful and have warranted the suggestion that these emanations may be beneficial in the treatment of consumption. Different substances give forth these emanations. We may select those that give the best results for the disease that is to be treated. Thorium acts as

radium, but not with the same degree of activity. The relative degrees of activity may be gathered from the calculation that five minutes' application of radium would be equivalent to ten years' application of the same weight of thorium.

These elements spontaneously give off emanations or gases in small quantity, which gases are themselves radio-active or endowed with the power of giving out rays similar to those radiated by the elements themselves. The process then suggested for utilizing these emanations for the cure of consumption would be to inhale the gases into the lungs and the radiation from the gases would produce the germicidal effect.

The salts of these two elements, which also possess the power of radiation, are not when solid in the best condition for the free escape of the emanations. When, however, the salt is dissolved the stored up emanations are immediately set free, and if these radiated gases are allowed to mingle with the air the patient breathes they will reach the air cells of the lungs and by their own radiations produce the desired effect.

There is a very great peculiarity about these gases and the solutions from which they come. If the emanations from a solution of radium be stored in a gasholder away from the solution, the quantity soon slowly diminishes, and if the solution be enclosed in an air-tight vessel the solution grows a fresh crop of radiations as fast as the old ones disappear. When all the old emanations have gone the solution has reached a maximum radio-activity equivalent to what it had on the dissolving of the salt. This makes a single solution efficient for any number of applications at intervals.

The time for the disappearance of the old emanations from a thorum solution and consequently for the reappearance of maximum activity in the solution is about five minutes. In the case of a radium solution the interval would be about three weeks. Hence when a patient is using a thorium solution it is important that the emanations should reach the lungs in the shortest possible time, since they appear and disappear at such short intervals. This means, however, that in the case of such a solution a continued breathing through it would always indicate a dose proportional to the time. With radium solutions, however, this would not be the case, for once all the emanations had been inhaled there would be no further use of breathing through it and the solution would have to be left tightly closed to regain its emanating power.

The beneficial effect does not cease with the exhalation of the emanations, for it is a property of these emanations to leave on the surfaces of the bodies they come in contact with a film of radio-active matter. This is called "excited" or "induced" radio-activity,

and this condition remains in the air cells of the lungs after the emanations have been exhaled.

A thorium salt like the nitrate, which is easily soluble in water, is recommended for such treatment. This salt is cheap and can be easily procured. It is claimed that there would be no ill effects from an hour's daily inhalation through a solution of 100 grams of thorium nitrate. On the contrary, on account of the great activity of radium only a few milligrams say of radium bromide should be employed and only a small quantity of the gas drawn into the lungs, the dose being increased very slowly.

As this treatment is only in the tentative stage and as these radiations are extremely energetic it should always be conducted under the guidance of a physician thoroughly conversant with the action of this new weapon which physics and chemistry have put into his hands.

The extent of these radio-active substances in nature and a possible natural confirmation of their therapeutic value may be drawn from the discovery of such gases in deep-level spring water and in the waters of several mineral springs.

Professor J. J. Thomson has found such radio-active gas in the waters of certain deep springs and in the tap water of Cambridge, England. In an examination of samples from the hot mineral springs of Bath made at the Blythswood Laboratory, Renfrew, similar radio-active gases were found. The activity of the gas begins to diminish soon after it has been liberated from the waters. This may indicate, as suggested by Mr. H. S. Allen, who communicates the facts to *Nature*, August 13, 1903, that the therapeutic value of the waters is due to the presence of radio-active gases in solution and that hence for the best results the waters must be used on the spot.

Mr. Allen concludes his letter with the following very interesting statement: "Professor Dewar has shown that the Bath waters contain helium. The presence of a radio-active and of an inert gas in the same water is of interest from the point of view of the possible transmutation of such elements."

Sir William Ramsay and Mr. Frederick Soddy in a paper transmitted to the Royal Society in July last and published in the abovementioned issue of *Nature* give some facts bearing on the possible transmutation of these elements. In the last paragraph of their paper they say: "The maximum amount of the emanation obtained from 50 milligrams of radium bromide was conveyed by means of oxygen into a U-tube, cooled in liquid air, and the latter was then extracted by the pump. It was then washed out with a little fresh oxygen, which was again pumped off. The vacuum tube sealed on to the U-tube, after removing the liquid air, showed no trace of

helium. The spectrum was apparently a new one, probably that of the emanation, but this has not yet been completely examined, and we hope to publish further details shortly. After standing from July 17 to 21, the helium spectrum appeared and the characteristic lines here observed were identical in position with those of a helium tube thrown into the field of vision at the same time. On July 22 the yellow, the green, the two blues and the violet were seen, and in addition the three new lines also present in the helium obtained from radium. A confirmatory experiment gave identical results."

THE MERCURY-VAPOR ELECTRIC LAMP.

This lamp, the invention of Mr. Peter Cooper Hewitt, has become an object of interest in the electrical world on account of its utility in other lines of electrical investigation. Essentially the lamp consists of a tube from which the air has been exhausted and provided with an electrical terminal at each end. The lower end of the tube is bulb shaped and contains mercury. This end forms the negative electrode. When a direct current is sent through the tube the vapor of mercury glows with a bluish white light. This light is considered beneficial on account of the absence of red rays, which are considered injurious to the eyesight. Its chief claim to consideration is its high efficiency, as seven times the amount of electrical energy would be consumed to obtain the same illumination from the ordinary incandescent lamp. As a practical source of illumination the lamp seems up to the present to be only moderately successful.

One characteristic of the lamp is that a high initial voltage is required to start the lamp and special devices were made for that purpose. Once it was started, however, it offered but a very moderate resistance to the passage of the current. These peculiarities were discovered while using the direct current. When, however, an alternating current was sent through the lamp a new application of the lamp was discovered. It was found that only the positive waves passed through, and that the negative waves were stopped. This at once suggested the possibility of the lamp as a transformer or rectifier to convert an alternating current into a direct one. At the present this is done by large and very expensive rotary converters.

To transform by means of the lamp all that is necessary is to supply as many positive terminals as there are phases to be transformed, and adding one additional terminal with the use of the

mercury-vapor lamp and one negative terminal a continuous series of electrical impulses in one direction or a direct current is obtained. It is said to be a transformer of high efficiency, that is the loss of electrical pressure in the transformation is small. If, for example, the pressure of the original alternating current was 1,400 volts, there would be a loss of only one per cent. in the direct current pressure. The simplicity and cheapness of the arrangement, if it proves to be a durable transformer, will undoubtedly give it a wide sphere of usefulness.

But yet another field seems to be open to the use of the mercury-vapor lamp, and that is the field of wireless telegraphy. In this particular field most attention has up to the present been given to the receiving apparatus, especially to the coherer. The coherer has undergone the greatest modification until we have the most sensitive of all in Marconi's magnetic detector.

In the sending apparatus the source of the transmitted electrical waves was the electrical discharge across a spark gap in the secondary circuit of an induction coil. Two difficulties are met with in this mode of stating the waves. One is that the rate of oscillation cannot be well controlled and the other is that the terminals either side of the spark gap, usually polished metal spheres, are rapidly burned away by the action of the electrical discharge.

In experimenting with the mercury-vapor lamp it was found that with a suitable condenser it became a means of disruptive discharges of any desired frequency. This places it as a transmitter of electrical waves at once efficient and simple. One salient feature of the lamp as a transmitter of electrical impulses is that the rate can be controlled and hence selective telegraphy may be assured. If this lamp commercially bears out the results which laboratory experiments indicate, it will be one of the most useful devices in the electrical field.

WIRELESS TELEPHONY.

When wireless telegraphy was given to the world it was most natural that investigators should turn their attention to wireless telephony. This many have done, and it is of scientific interest to note their success. Up to the present the distances to which conversation can satisfactorily be carried on by the wireless method are not very great, but yet sufficiently so to open up a field of usefulness for the new method. The most interesting of the later experi-

ments in this direction are those of Mr. A. Frederick Collins, described in the *Scientific American* for May 23 last.

Mr. Collins has been experimenting for three years, with the result that he was able to telephone between two ferry boats moving in opposite directions on the North River between Jersey City and New York. In general character the arrangements of the sending and receiving instruments are like those of the wireless telegraph. Antennæ are required, as in the latter system, and for this purpose wires strung from the flagstaffs of the boats answered admirably. To get a good earth contact was not so easy. It seemed simple enough at first, and it was first made by attaching metal plates to their wires and throwing them overboard into the water. Although these plates weighed ten pounds, the rapid motion of the boat prevented them from sinking and they danced upon the water, thus frequently interrupting the earth contact. Better results were obtained by dropping heavy copper tubing down the rain pipes to the water. But even then the contact was not satisfactory. In any practical application of the method, however, this difficulty can be overcome by attaching the plates to the bottom of the vessel.

In the first test after the installation of the instruments on the two boats a message was distinctly received from the inventor when the two boats were five hundred feet apart. The next day, May 9, a public test was made, with like success. It must be remembered that in these tests the water contacts were poor and the battery current inadequate. In experiments at Congers articulate speech was heard a distance of 6,000 feet. When the inventor was asked how far he hoped to communicate under the new conditions on the boats he would not predict more than 1,000 feet.

The capability of doing even this much would be of great value in time of storms and fogs. No expert telegrapher would be required, no time would be lost in translating the message and many harbor accidents thereby avoided.

D. T. O'Sullivan, S. J.

Boston, Mass.

Book Reviews.

THE GREAT ENCYCLICAL LETTERS OF POPE LEO XIII. Translations from Approved Sources. With Preface by Rev. John J. Wynne, S. J. 8vo., pp. 580. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The writer of the preface to this book introduces it very nicely in these words:

"The popular demand for the Encyclicals and Apostolical Letters of a Roman Pontiff is something so novel as to constitute of itself a proof of the esteem in which he is held. It would seem that whatever is written of Leo XIII. in books or newspapers, instead of satisfying the universal desire for a knowledge of him, only inspires the wish to know more and the conviction that the writings of a man of such powers and world-wide sympathies must contain messages of interest and benefit to all humanity.

"It is precisely the merit of the letters of the late Pope that no matter when they were written, or to whom they were addressed, they are of actual and universal interest, as intelligible to the layman and illiterate as to the theologian and scholar; as urgent in their appeals to those who are not within the fold of which he was chief pastor as to the children of the household. His arguments could not but command attention, drawn as they were from history, experience and reason, as well as from Scripture and tradition; and his sincere interest in the civil and social improvements of every nation, whether Catholic or not, made all hearken to his plea for religion as a chief factor of true progress."

A glance at the contents of this book will show that the writer of this introduction does not exaggerate. The variety of the subjects is surprising, and the universal application of the matter still more so. Sociology, philosophy, theology, economics, politics—using the word in its best sense—history, ascetics—all are handled in a masterly manner by this wonderful Pontiff.

His writings are all distinguished for their clearness, their broadness, their learning; but the most striking feature of those which appeal most strongly to the average reader is their timeliness and their practical application to existing conditions. A striking illustration of this is found in his Letter over the Relations of Employer and Workman. It may be truthfully said that this document alone would settle all disputes between employer and workman, and prevent misunderstandings in the future, if those concerned would study it and follow its directions. It is worthy of lengthy quotation because its application is so clear at the present time:

"For the result of civil change and revolution has been to divide

society into two widely differing castes. On the one side there is the party which holds power because it holds wealth; which has in its grasp the whole of labor and trade; which manipulates for its own benefit and its own purposes all the sources of supply, and which is even represented in the councils of the State itself. On the other side there is the needy and powerless multitude, broken down and suffering, and ever ready for disturbance. If working people can be encouraged to look forward to obtaining a share in the land, the consequence will be that the gulf between vast wealth and sheer poverty will be bridged over, and the respective classes will be brought nearer to one another. A further consequence will result in the greater abundance of the fruits of the earth. Men always work harder and more readily when they work on that which belongs to them; nay, they learn to love the very soil that yields, in response to the labor of their hands, not only food to eat, but an abundance of good things for themselves and those that are dear to them. That such a spirit of willing labor would add to the produce of the earth and to the wealth of the community is self-evident. And a third advantage would spring from this: men would cling to the country in which they were born; for no one would exchange his country for a foreign land if his own afforded the means of living a decent and happy life. These three important benefits, however, can be reckoned on only provided that a man's means be not drained and exhausted by excessive taxation. The right to possess private property is derived from nature, not from man, and the State has the right to control its use in the interests of the public good alone, but by no means to absorb it altogether. The State would, therefore, be unjust and cruel if under the name of taxation it were to deprive the private owner of more than is fitting.

"If we turn now to things external and corporeal, the first concern of all is to save the poor workers from the cruelty of greedy speculators, who use human beings as mere instruments of money-making. It is neither just nor human so to grind men down with excessive labor as to stupefy their minds and wear out their bodies. Man's powers, like his general nature, are limited, and beyond these limits he cannot go. His strength is developed and increased by use and exercise, but only on condition of due intermission and proper rest. Daily labor, therefore, should be so regulated as not to be protracted over longer hours than the strength admits. How many and how long the intervals of rest should be must depend on the nature of the work, on circumstances of time and place, and on the health and strength of the workmen. Those who work in mines and quarries, and extract coal, stone and metals from the

bowels of the earth, should have shorter hours in proportion as their labor is more severe and trying to health. Then again the season of the year should be taken into account; for not infrequently a kind of labor is easy at one time which at another is intolerable or exceedingly difficult. Finally, work which is quite suitable for a strong man cannot reasonably be required from a woman or child. And in regard to children, great care should be taken not to place them in workshops and factories until their bodies and minds are sufficiently developed. For just as very rough weather destroys the buds of spring, so does too early an experience of life's hard toil blight the young promise of a child's faculties, and render any true education impossible. Women, again, are not suited for certain occupations; a woman is by nature fitted for home work, and it is that which is best adapted at once to preserve her modesty and to promote the good bringing-up of children and the well-being of the family. As a general principle it may be laid down that a workman ought to have leisure and rest proportionate to the wear and tear of his strength; for waste of strength must be repaired by cessation from hard work.

"Let it then be taken for granted that workman and employer should, as a rule, make free agreements, and in particular should agree freely as to wages; nevertheless, there underlies a dictate of natural justice more imperious and ancient than any bargain between man and man, namely, the remuneration ought to be sufficient to support a frugal and well-behaved wage-earner. If through necessity or fear of a worse evil the workman accept harder conditions because an employer or contractor will afford him no better, he is made the victim of force and injustice. In these and similar questions, however—such as, for example, the hours of labor in different trades, the sanitary precautions to be observed in factories and workshops, etc.—times and localities differ so widely, it is advisable that recourse be had to societies or boards such as we shall mention.

"But if the question be asked, How must one's possessions be used? the Church replies without hesitation in the words of the holy Doctor: 'Man should not consider his outward possessions as his own, but as common to all, so as to share them without hesitation when others are in need. Whence the Apostle saith, Command the rich of this world . . . to offer with no stint, to apportion largely.' True, no one is commanded to distribute to others that which is required for his own needs and those of his household; nor even to give away what is reasonably required to keep up becomingly his condition in life; 'for no one ought to live other than becomingly.' But when what necessity demands has been supplied and one's standing fairly taken thought for, it becomes a duty to

give to the indigent out of what remains over. 'Of that which remaineth give alms.' It is a duty, not of justice (save in extreme cases), but of Christian charity—a duty not enforced by human law. But the laws and judgments of men must yield place to the laws and judgments of Christ the true God, who in many ways urges on His followers the practice of almsgiving: 'It is more blessed to give than to receive;' and who will count a kindness done or refused to the poor as done or refused to Himself: 'As long as you did it to one of My least brethren, you did it to Me.'"

The wide circulation of this collection must do incalculable good. Its interest and value are not limited to any particular class, but they appeal to all. The publishers have rendered a real service to the public by making the collection so accessible, and whoever made the selection has also placed us under no slight obligation.

CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS; or, a Rational Exposition of the Foundations of Faith. By *Rev. W. Devivier, S. J.* Translated from the Sixteenth Edition of the Original French. Preceded by an Introduction on the Existence of God, and a Treatise on the Human Soul, its Liberty, Spirituality, Immortality and Destiny. By Rev. L. Peeters, S. J. Edited augmented and adapted to English Readers by Rev. Joseph C. Sasia, S. J. Two volumes, 8vo., pp. 557 and 430. San Jose, Cal.: Papp & Hogan, Printers. Price, $2.50 for two volumes. For sale by leading Catholic booksellers.

CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS: A Defense of the Catholic Faith. By *Rev. W. Devivier, S. J.* Translated by Miss Ella McMahon. Edited by the Right Rev. S. G. Messmer, D. D., D. C. L., Bishop of Green Bay, Wis. 8vo., pp. 583. Price, $1.75 net. New York: Benziger Brothers

By a rare coincidence two translations of the same book have come from the press at the same time with publishers as far part as New York and California. This speaks well for the zeal of the learned editors who are devoting themselves to such excellent work. It also indicates the value of the original, which attracted the attention of scholars having no connection with one another, but who independently deemed it worthy of reproduction. It gives promise of the rapid advancement of truth, for the spread of books like this is the same as the diffusion of light.

In the main they are the same book, and therefore there is no opposition between them. Nor should there be any real competition, but they should advance from opposite sides to combat error and crush it between them.

The usual order is followed. The work is divided into two parts, treating respectively of "The Christian Religion" and "The Roman Catholic Church." In the first division, after general explanations, we have chapters on the "Historic Value of the Bible," the "Demonstration of the Divinity of the Christian Religion" and the

"Divinity of Christ," with a consideration of all the incidental questions that are necessarily connected with these.

In the second division, after general notions have been disposed of, the thesis that "The Church of Rome is the True Church of Jesus Christ" is set forth and defended. This is followed by an examination of "Certain Prerogatives Conferred by Jesus Christ on His Church" and "Certain Accusations Against the Church." The division closes with a chapter on the "Church and Civilization." We have not enumerated the sub-divisions because they are too numerous and they follow in logical order. We shall not dwell on the relative merits of the two translations, because they are both good and serve the purpose of making the truth known. Nor shall we stop to point out minor defects which are incidental to all human work, book-making not excepted. Let us rather remind the reader that no better book can be found to explain and defend Christianity in general, and the Catholic Church in particular than the work before us.

May we not truthfully say that ignorance of the truth is the great evil of the day? May not many of the other great evils, if not most of them, be traced back to this ignorance of Divine Truth and of the divinely appointed exponent of it, the Church of Jesus Christ? This ignorance is due principally to our system of education, which is almost universally altogether secular. We must dispel it by spreading the truth. We have excellent opportunities in the large manufacturing establishments and stores where great crowds from many directions are brought together.

If a manual like the one before us could be read in such places, darkness would roll away as the night before the sun. But since this is not practicable, those who are members of the true fold should prepare themselves to give an account at all times for the faith that is in them.

In the two volume edition of the work there is much additional matter. The editor informs us that he has added 450 pages in order to adapt it better to the English-speaking public, and to fit it to meet the demands of a wider class of readers in every condition of society.

The first 206 pages treat of the existence of God, of His principal attributes or perfections, and of the liberty, spirituality and immortality of the human soul, with convincing answers to the most common objections. An entire article of thirty-one pages has been added on the destiny of the human soul, the sanction of God's laws and the eternal punishment to be inflicted on impenitent sinners.

An article of twenty pages on so-called Christian science is very timely.

A group of important notes at the end of the second volume is well worthy of notice.

Altogether it is a great book, and we hope that it will have a sale in keeping with its importance.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS—1493-1898. Explorations by Early Navigators, Descriptions of the Islands and their Peoples, their History and Records of the Catholic Missions, as related in Contemporaneous Books and Manuscripts, showing the Political, Economic, Commercial and Religious Conditions of those Islands from their earliest relations with European Nations to the end of the Nineteenth Century. Translated from the Originals. Edited and annotated by Emma Helen Blair and James Alexander Robertson, with historical introduction and additional notes by Edward Gaylord Bourne. With Maps, Portraits and other illustrations. In fifty-five volumes. Volume V., 1582-1583. Octavo, pp. 320. Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Co.

A very important announcement accompanies this volume of the greatest work on the Philippines. Originally the publishers intended to bring it down to the beginning of the nineteenth century; now it will be extended to the end of that century. This is possible without increasing the number of volumes, and therefore without advancing the price of the work.

The announcement is most welcome, because it was a matter of regret to all who were interested in the work and who had observed the masterly and exhaustive manner in which it was being done, that it was not to cover the whole field. It is hardly likely that a similar work will ever be done because this work supplies every need and unless the present publishers continued it, probably it would never have been supplemented on the same scale as the original. Now the value of the work is very much increased, because it will be complete to date.

Although the present volume covers only two years, they are pregnant with events of great importance. These are of particular interest to Catholic readers because they include the coming of the zealous and fearless Bishop Domingo de Salazar. "The Spanish conquerors are ruthlessly oppressing the Indians, caring but little for the opposition made by the friars; but Salazar exerts as far as possible his ecclesiastical authority, and, besides, vigorously urges the King to shield those unfortunate victims of Spanish rapacity. Various humane laws are accordingly enacted for the protection of the natives, but of course this interference by the Bishop occasions a bitter hostility between the ecclesiastical and the secular powers—perhaps never to be quieted. With Salazar come Jesuit fathers, who establish in the islands the missionary work of that order.

"In a letter dated June 16, 1582, Governor Penalosa reports that

the conversion of the natives is making good progress, but there are not enough missionaries. He recommends that a convent be established in every city and village, and that missionaries be sent directly from the mother country, rather than from New Spain, as in the latter case they soon become discontented after coming to the Philippines. He complains because the Franciscans have gone to China."

This volume also contains a short account of the first settlement of Nueva Segovia in 1582. By far the most valuable and interesting feature is a letter to the authorities in Spain written by a soldier named Miguel de Loarca, who was one of the earlier conquerors and settlers there. "Beginning with Cebú, as the first settlement was made therein, he describes each island then known to the Spaniards in the group—noting its size, contour and population; and enumerating the encomiendas assigned therein, the officials in the Spanish settlements, the products of the islands, etc.

"With this information Loarca incorporates many interesting details regarding the social and economic condition of the natives." He also describes at some length the religious beliefs of the Pintados or Visayan Indians.

Two Papal decrees dated September 15 and October 20, 1582, found the Philippine province of the Dominican Order.

Too much cannot be said in praise of the way in which this work is progressing, and we feel that we are doing a favor to educational institutions in calling their attention to the importance of procuring it.

IRELAND UNDER ENGLISH RULE; or, a Plea for the Plaintiff. By *Thomas Addis Emmett, M. D., LL. D.* Two volumes, 8vo., pp. xxv.-233 and 358. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

The author thus states his purpose in writing these two beautiful volumes:

"The object of the writer has been to trace certain causes and effects and to show, what is self-evident in the abstract, that no result can be produced without an adequate cause. As the chief proposition it will be shown that Ireland has only prospered under English rule for a brief interval—when at least Irishmen managed Irish affairs, although these were conducted by a minority, with the added disadvantage that fully eight-tenths of the population of Ireland at that time were disfranchised on a religious test. The logical deduction then presents itself that Ireland has never prospered because of misrule on the part of the English Government.

"This will be proved to have been the case, as well as that Irish

affairs were conducted by England for centuries in accordance with a settled and fixed purpose that Ireland should not prosper. As part of the indictment against England it will be shown that only within a recent period has the effort been abandoned, whenever an opportunity presented, to exterminate by the sword the Catholic portion of the population; since that time, the same policy has been indirectly but as successfully followed in depopulating the country by famine and forced emigration. Only the more prominent instances will be cited in proof, but even these form a pandemonium of horrors, more brutal in detail than could be gleaned from the deeds of any other civilized nation."

The writer tells us that he has no quarrel with the English people as individuals, but that his indictment is against that "unique political organization known as the British Government—a system well fitted for the oppression of the whole human race, with the exception of the English people themselves; with a settled policy since the Norman conquest, which has remained unchanged in the quest of gain and new territory."

Although this indictment is severe, yet the facts quoted to substantiate it are numerous and overwhelming. Nor can it be said that the author is prejudiced. He shows throughout the work a true spirit of fairness and a desire to tell only the truth. It is not the business of the historian to suppress the truth or to color it, and Dr. Emmett is an historian.

It is a sad, dreary story, interesting but far from pleasant, but it must be told.

The publishers deserve great credit for the manner in which they have done their part. A nicer piece of bookmaking could not be found.

A Latin Grammar. By William Gardner Hale, Professor and Head of the Department of Latin, and Carl Darling Buck, Professor of Sanskrit and Indo-European Comparative Philology in the University of Chicago. 12mo., cloth, 388 pages. Ginn & Co., New York and Boston. List price, $1.00.

This new Latin grammar is the work of specialists and embodies the results of many years of independent study in their respective fields. It therefore presents the facts of the language in their true relations to one another.

The field covered by the book is the syntax actually found in high school Latin, with the addition of a small number of constructions which were necessary for a general skeleton of the treatment. All matters that do not occur at all in high school Latin or that are rare

in the Latin ordinarily read in colleges, have been studiously omitted. For the use of high school or college teachers these extraneous topics and special idioms are presented in a special supplement now in preparation.

In general, the authors have aimed to give only such explanations as are certain, reasonable, simple and deal with the relations between existing Latin forms. Nevertheless, care has been taken to present the true historical development of the language in a way that will best appeal to the intelligence of the young student, that will be most helpful to his memory and that will give him a sound foundation for possible further study.

The citations in the grammar are those given for all the examples taken from actual Latin—most of them from the Latin read in the high school; but here and there other examples have been chosen as more simple or as affording parallels in a series.

DIE GESCHICHTE DES LEIDENS UND STERBENS, der Auferstehung und Himmelfahrt des Herrn. Von *Dr. Joannes Belser.* Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Price, $2.85 net.

The learned professor of theology at the University of Tübingen, whose admirable "Introduction to the New Testament" we commended in a recent issue, here gives us in a volume of 524 pages a complete and detailed narrative of the sufferings and death, the resurrection and ascension of Our Lord. We have no hesitation in pronouncing Dr. Belser's work as, away and beyond, the erudite and scientific treatise on these sublime subjects which we have met with in any language. It displays in an eminent degree that blending of piety and learning which is essential to every successful religious work. May it soon appear among us in our own tongue.

ALLEN AND GREENOUGH'S NEW LATIN GRAMMAR. For Higher Schools and Colleges. By J. B. Greenough, late Professor of Latin in Harvard University; George Lyman Kittredge, Professor of English in Harvard University; A. A. Howard, Professor of Latin in Harvard University, and Benjamin L. D'Ooge, Professor of Latin in the Michigan State Normal College. Ginn & Company, Boston and New York. List price, $1.20.

This well-known Latin grammar, although in a new form, still remains the "Allen and Greenough Grammar" in scope and general plan, and retains the characteristic qualities that have given the book a world-wide distinction. But the book has been revised in every detail to bring it into harmony with the latest results of scholarship

the world over, and has been rearranged where necessary to make it as convenient for use as is possible.

The authors have been assisted on details by the most eminent specialists, among whom are Professor Sheldon, of Harvard University, and Professor Morris, of Yale University. The book therefore is thoroughly trustworthy. All the most recent grammatical theories have been considered, and if they have not been adopted it is because the old ones are better. The paragraphs have been renumbered throughout and the typography of the book has been completely changed. A new scheme of type display unquestionably marks the highest typographical achievement in books of this character.

THE JONES READERS. Five volumes. 12mo. Ginn & Co., Boston and New York.

This series is intended to cover the reading work of the eight grades of the elementary schools. The author, President L. H. Jones, of the Michigan State Normal College, formerly Superintendent of the city schools of Indianapolis and later of Cleveland, is well equipped for work of this kind, which requires exceptional experience and judgment. It is not sufficient to gather together many pleasing selections, but they must be gathered from approved sources, must teach useful lessons, and must be suited to the capacity of those for whom the books are intended. The author has kept all these requirements before him, and the result is a series that will command attention and patronage. The publishers tell us that "especial care has been taken to secure a definite moral effect in addition to intellectual development. Along with their daily reading, pupils will gradually and unconsciously acquire correct standards of conduct and right views of life."

This is as it should be, but we don't believe it can be done successfully without coming into conflict with the sectarian bugbear. Of course our readers will understand that these moral lessons are not taught in the Catholic way or by Catholic authors, with one or two exceptions. Otherwise the books are excellent in every respect.

COLONEL ALEXANDER K. MCCLURE'S RECOLLECTIONS OF HALF A CENTURY. Large 8vo., pp. vii. x 502. Illustrated. Salem, Mass.: The Salem Press Co.

The author thus declares his purpose:

"I shall give in these chapters of random recollections important

contributions to history, made especially entertaining and instructive by personal knowledge and incident. After more than fifty years of active participation in political and public affairs, the most of the time closely related to the great political movements of all parties in State and nation, with personal acquaintance, more or less intimate with the leading chieftains of peace and war, I hope to furnish new and fresh contributions to the history of our great Republic outside of the ordinary lines of historical record."

Few men are as well fitted for work of this kind as Colonel McClure. To the general qualifications with which nature endowed him, and which were developed by a good general education, have been added the training of the lawyer, the politician and the journalist. He has very many interesting things to say, and he says them in an interesting manner.

The illustrations are an important feature of the book. In several instances they are reproductions of old photographs. The book is well made.

TRACTATUS DE DEO-HOMINE, SIVE DE VERBO INCARNATO. Auctore *Laurentio Janssens, S. T. D.* Two volumes. I., Christologia. Price, $3.60. II., Mariologia et Soteriologia. Price, $4.25. Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis.

These two stately volumes form the fifth and sixth tomes of Janssen's great commentary on the Summa of St. Thomas, adapted to the needs of modern times. The author, a Belgian Benedictine of the Beuron Congregation, is Rector of St. Anselm's College in Rome and Consultor of the Congregation of the Index. The work is worthy of the palmiest days of Benedictine industry, and reflects great credit on the illustrious Order to which the author belongs. True to the motto which he has adopted, he brings forth from a well-treasured mind "nova et vetera." He has the rare art of clothing the most recondite truths in the simplest words and can be read throughout with extreme ease. Especially commendable is his treatment of the place of Mary in the plan of redemption. There is a warmth of expression about his Mariology which springs from the depths of a loving heart and communicates itself to the reader. We strongly commend the work, especially to the preachers of the divine word.

INSTRUCTIO PASTORALIS EYSTETTENSIS. Editio quinta Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis. 620 pages. Price, $2.85.

This widely known book was first issued during the episcopate of Bishop Raymond Anthony, the sixty-sixth successor of St. Willi-

bald in the venerable see of Eichstätt in Bavaria. This was as long ago as the year 1768. The original manuscript informs us that the compilers were Dr. Ignatius Heissig, canon and confessor of the Bishop and the Jesuit Father Paul Krauss. As a condensed manual containing the most needful information for the instruction of the clergy in charge of souls, it stands unequaled, and richly deserves the place in the esteem of Bishops and pastors which it has kept for above a century. The fifth edition, much increased in volume and thoroughly revised, brings it completely down to date. No department of pastoral activity will be found to have been overlooked. For Bishops making the canonical visitation of their dioceses and for hard-worked priests on the mission who wish to be well-informed on all practical subjects pertaining to their duties, we know of no better book. We also recommend it warmly to those who are preparing themselves for clerical examinations.

CASUS CONSCIENTIAE ad usum confessariorum compositi et soluti: ab Augustino Lehmkuhl, S. J. Vol. 1. Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis. Price, $2.40 net.

True to his word, Father Lehmkuhl presents us the first and remaining volume of his Cases of Conscience a half year after the appearance of the previously published second volume. The cases proposed and disposed of in the present volume cover thoroughly the ground usually treated of in the first part of our Moral Theologies, namely, the fundamental principles of Christian ethics, the commandments of God, the precepts of the Church, justice, contracts, etc. That the work is extremely valuable goes without saying. We could wish that those who discourse so glibly about "Jesuit casuistry" would take the trouble to scan this collection of Cases of Conscience and see for themselves upon how solid a basis the edifice of Catholic morality is erected.

INSTITUTIONES JURIS ECCLESIASTICI. Quas in Usum Scholarum scripsit *Jos. Laurentius, S. J.* Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Price, net $3.50.

We have no hesitation in pronouncing this the most perfect textbook of Canon Law which we have ever read. Within the compass of 680 pages the student has a full survey of the Church Laws presented to him in the clearest, plainest and most intelligible manner. From beginning to end the exposition goes forward with a simple majesty that is truly admirable. No one who exercises any ecclesiastical office can afford to take a step without consulting Laurentius. The index is full and complete.

70781

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

PERIODICAL